.....ALCOVE

No.....

Abstract of Regulations.

1. Books marked with a star in the catalogue will not be allowed to circulate, but may be consulted in the Library.

2. Residents of the city, who have complied with the provisions of the By-Laws, may draw two volumes at a time; residents of the county, outside of the city, three volumes.

3. Books so drawn may be retained TWO WEEKS, and must then be returned. The same volumes may be re-drawn for two weeks longer, but no more.

4. If any book is injured or soiled, so as, in the opinion of the Library Committee, to be unfit to remain on the shelves, the person responsible for the same shall pay the market price thereof or of the set to which it belongs. If the injury be less than above specified, the person responsible therefor shall pay a fine of one dollar.

5. Any person failing to return a book at the end of two weeks, shall pay a fine of two cents a day for each day's detention beyond the time specified.

6. In all cases where fines or other penalties are imposed for breach of these rules, the person offending shall forfeit all rights to the benefits and privileges of the Library until such fines or penalties are paid.

THE APOSTLES

THE APOSTLES

INCLUDING

THE PERIOD FROM THE DEATH OF JESUS UNTIL THE GREATER MISSIONS OF PAUL

BY

ERNEST RENAN

AUTHOR OF "THE HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL" "LIFE OF JESUS," "ANTICHRIST," ETC.

TRANSLATED AND EDITED

BY

JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN, D.D.

LATE LECTURER ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

BOSTON
ROBERTS BROTHERS
1898

Copyright, 1898,
By Roberts Brothers.

All rights reserved.

University Press:
John Wilson and Son, Cambridge, U.S.A.

EDITOR'S PREFACE.

In the three volumes of this series, now consisting of eight, which it has been my task to execute, it has been my first endeavour to give an absolutely faithful transcript of the form and colour of the writer's thought, while reserving entire freedom as to both grammatical structure and the rendering of special phrases. The first is the translator's evident duty; the other is his necessary privilege. The task, done in my 78th year, has been found unexpectedly laborious; for a time, indeed, the strain upon nerve and eyesight threatened to make it impracticable. At the same time, I have found great joy in the execution of it, with an increasing sense of the grandeur and nobility of the theme, — the establishment of Christianity as a moral power in the world, — to a right understanding of which it has been the chief aim and hope of my working years to contribute, however humbly. In this task I have sought aid from the best authorities within my reach. These have been, in addition to a score or two of Greek and Latin texts, the standard lexicons of those tongues, together with Sophocles', of later Greek, and Gesenius', of Hebrew; the great "Century" dictionaries, Smith's

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

of Classical Antiquities, and McClintock and Strong's Biblical Encyclopædia. For special renderings I have relied on Littré (manual ed.), and have received help from the vast and inestimable encyclopædic dictionary of Larousse. Except this last, these have all been kept at my side, and habitually in use. The author's very numerous references to the New Testament have been ordinarily verified by comparison with the Greek original and the various readings in Schulz. Where — as in the volume entitled "Antichrist" — entire passages have been quoted, I have preferred to follow the author's French, as a guide to an independent translation directly from the Greek, rather than to copy from the Revised Version, whose great value as textual commentary should not excuse its infelicities of diction and its errors of grammatical construction.[1]

It is probable that so complete a picture of the moral and social condition of the world at a great historical epoch has never been elsewhere given, as will be found in the concluding chapters of the present volume. To the completeness and vivacity of this picture three qualities have much contributed, which, it may be thought, have greatly impeded the writer's reputation as an historian and a critic. These are, first, an artist's imagination, which puts him under

[1] See "Unitarian Review" for June, 1888, p. 553. For example, to translate τολμᾷ, in Romans v. 7, by "would dare," is *grammatically impossible.* The revisers have here retained the old error. The correct meaning is, "one *readily dares,*" etc. (See *id.* for Oct. 1888, p. 307.)

the constant temptation to give more definite form and colour to the figures on his canvas than can always be strictly verified from our rather meagre sources of information; then, a curious faculty of historic sympathy, which insists on studying the race, temperament, and even the passing mood of his actors, with the very play of their passion and motive, making (so to speak) the moral atmosphere of their acts; finally, a familiarity with the Catholic tradition which gives the key to numberless characters and transactions that would be unintelligible without such aid. With these qualities, he has often been disparaged as a writer of sentimental romance rather than an historian. Without them, he would descend to the level of his critics; and no one who has studied him (as we study Gibbon) in his footnotes can doubt that here he might well compete for the epithet "dry-as-dust," and hold his own with the best and dullest of them. Some persons find it hard to believe that an artist may also be an anatomist; but, in this case, we may be content to accept the verdict of Mommsen, who said that Renan was "a true scholar, in spite of the beauty of his style." It is, perhaps, needless to say that there are some things in each volume from which I totally dissent; but it is no part of my present business, as I conceive it, to suppress or to controvert them.

Respecting the marginal references, especially to such writers as Tacitus, Suetonius, and Josephus, I will only say that I have verified enough of them to

satisfy me of the author's general care and accuracy, and here I think it is best to stop, leaving the responsibility with his own edition, the thirteenth. I have, however (while giving the full sense of every note), transcribed the minuter references so fully in detail that the curious student, with the wealth of a great library at command, need not be at a loss in tracing to its source any mention of the obscurest inscription, coin, or anecdote.

J. H. A.

Cambridge, Mass.,
February, 1898.

CONTENTS.

		Page
INTRODUCTION: A Critical Review of the Original Documents		1
Chapter		
I.	Accounts of the Resurrection of Jesus. — A. D. 33	41
II.	The Retreat in Galilee. — A. D. 33	60
III.	The Return to Jerusalem. — A. D. 34	73
IV.	Descent of the Holy Spirit. — A. D. 34	81
V.	The Primitive Church a Community. — A. D. 35	94
VI.	Jewish Converts and Proselytes. — A. D. 36	113
VII.	Charitable Acts and Institutions. — A. D. 36	122
VIII.	First Persecution and the Death of Stephen. — A. D. 37	137
IX.	First Missions; Philip the Deacon. — A. D. 38	148
X.	The Conversion of Paul. — A. D. 38	157
XI.	The Church in Judæa. — A. D. 38–41	177
XII.	Antioch. — A. D. 41	194
XIII.	Barnabas; a Mission to the Gentiles. — A. D. 42–44	204
XIV.	Persecution Under Herod Agrippa. — A. D. 44	213
XV.	Simon of Gitton (Simon Magus). — A. D. 45	226
XVI.	General Course of Christian Missions. — A. D. 45.	237
XVII.	General Condition of the World. — A. D. 45	255
XVIII.	Laws Affecting Religion. — A. D. 45	283
XIX.	The Future of Missions. — A. D. 45	296
INDEX		313

INTRODUCTION.

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

THE first volume of these "Beginnings of Christian History"[1] has followed the course of events as far as the death and burial of Jesus. We have now to take up the narrative at this point, namely, Saturday, the 4th of April, A. D. 33. For some time yet it will be, in a way, a continuation of the "Life of Jesus." After those months of intoxicating joy, during which the great Founder laid the groundwork for a new order in human affairs, these succeeding years are the most decisive in the world's history. The same Jesus who, by the sacred spark of life which he kindled in the heart of a few friends, created the most august of human institutions, still stirs and renews the hearts of men, stamping that divine seal upon them all. Under that influence, ever active and victorious over death, we shall see confirmed faith in the resurrection, in the agency of the Holy Spirit, in the gift of tongues, in the authority of the Church. We shall trace the organising of the Church at Jerusalem, its first trials, its early conquests, the primitive missions proceeding from its bosom. We shall follow the swift progress of Christianity through Syria as far as Antioch, where a second capital is founded, in one sense more important than Jerusalem, and destined to supplant it.

In this new centre, where Pagan converts make the majority, we shall see Christianity definitely part company with Judaism, and take a distinctive name. Above all, we shall

[1] "Life of Jesus," published in this series in 1896.

witness the birth of that grand idea of distant missions, which are to carry the name of Jesus into the Gentile world. We shall pause at the solemn moment when Paul, Barnabas, and John Mark set forth for the execution of this great design. Here we shall suspend our story, to throw a glance upon the world whose conversion is the aim of these bold messengers; and shall try to make clear to ourselves the intellectual, political, moral, religious, and social condition of the Roman Empire about the year 45, the probable date of Saint Paul's departure on his first mission.

Such is the subject of this second volume. I call it "The Apostles," because it sets forth the period of action in common, while the little household of Jesus walks together, and is morally grouped about the one centre, Jerusalem. The third will carry us beyond this "upper room," and show Saint Paul almost alone upon the stage, the man who more than any other represents Christianity as a conqueror and wayfarer. Paul, though after a certain crisis he assumed the name Apostle, by no means had the same title to it with the Twelve.[1] He is a labourer who has come in at the second hour, almost an intruder. The condition of the documents that have come down to us tends to deceive us on this point. Since we know far more facts relating to Paul than to the Twelve, and since we have his own writings, with very exact memorials on various incidents of his career, we ascribe to him the very highest importance, almost higher than that accorded to Jesus. This is an error. Paul is a very great man, whose share in the founding of Christianity was of the utmost value. But he is not to be compared with Jesus, or even with the immediate disciples of Jesus. Paul had never seen the Master, or tasted the fragrance of the ministry in Galilee. The most ordinary man who had shared in that heavenly manna is, in that one thing, the superior of one who has savoured only (as it were) an aftertaste of it. Nothing is more false than a view which

[1] The writer of Acts never once gives this name to Paul, reserving it exclusively to the members of the central group at Jerusalem.

has come into fashion in our day: that Paul was the real founder of Christianity. Jesus was the real Founder. The highest place after him is to be reserved for those great but obscure companions of his, those impassioned and loyal women, who even in spite of death believed in him. Paul was in the first century, so to speak, a man apart. He left no established school. On the contrary, he left eager adversaries, who after his death desired to exclude him from the Church, and to put him upon the footing of Simon Magus.[1] He was bereft even of that which we hold to have been his special work, the conversion of the Gentiles.[2] The church at Corinth, which he alone had founded,[3] claimed that its origin was due both to him and to Peter.[4] In the second century, Papias and Justin do not once speak his name. Afterwards, when oral tradition was no longer anything, when scripture was all, Paul took leading rank in Christian theology. He had, in short, a theology, which Peter and Mary Magdalen had not. He has left writings of importance; those of the other Apostles cannot contend with his in weight or in authenticity.

At first view, the documents for the period embraced in this volume are few and quite unsatisfying. First-hand evidence is found only in the earlier chapters of "Acts;" and the historical value of these is open to grave objections. The obscurity is, it is true, partly dispelled by the closing chapters of the Gospels, and especially by Paul's epistles. An ancient writing serves, first, to make the period of its composition known, and, secondly, that which was just before. Every written document, in fact, suggests inferences as to the social condition out of which it has sprung. The epistles of Paul, dictated from A. D. 53 to 62, or there-

[1] Pseudo-Clementine Homilies, xvii. 13–19.

[2] Justin, *Apol.* i. 39. The idea also predominates in Acts that Peter was the Apostle to the Gentiles : see, especially, chap. x. and compare 1 Pet. i. 1.

[3] 1 Cor. iii. 6, 10; iv. 14, 15; ix. 1, 2; 2 Cor. xi. 2–4.

[4] Letter of Dionysius of Corinth, in Euseb. ii. 25.

about, are full of information as to the first years of Christian history. Since, moreover, we have to treat of great foundations without precise data, our first task is to show the conditions under which they took shape. As to this I have to say, once for all, that the dates I have given to these chapters are only approximate. There are few fixed points of chronology in these early years. Still, — thanks to the care taken by the writer of "Acts" to keep the true succession of events, — thanks to "Galatians," in which we find some numerical hints of the highest value, and to Josephus, who supplies the dates of secular events connected with the apostolic history, — we can stretch a reasonably probable canvas for our story, in which the chances of error are kept within very narrow limits.

Here I will say again what I said in the preface to the "Life of Jesus."[1] In histories like this, where we can be sure only of the main fact, while all details are more or less open to doubt from the legendary character of the documents, hypothesis is unavoidable. Hypothesis has no place regarding periods wholly unknown. An attempt to reconstruct a group of ancient statuary which we are sure once existed, but of which no remnant and no written description survives, is a purely arbitrary task. But what can be more legitimate than an attempt to reconstruct the pediments of the Parthenon from the portions which still exist, with the aid of ancient descriptions, drawings of the seventeenth century, and information of every sort, — in a word, by catching the inspiration of the style of these inimitable fragments, and trying to seize their soul and life? We cannot say that, with all this, we have rediscovered the work of the ancient sculptor, but we have done what we could to come near it. Such a process is the more permissible in history, inasmuch as language allows degrees of precision which marble does not. We may even grant the reader his free choice among various suppositions. The writer's conscience may be at ease when he has stated as certain what is cer-

[1] See p. 29 of the American translation.

tain, as likely what is likely, as possible what is possible. Where the footing is unsteady between history and legend, he can aim only at the general result. In the succeeding volume, — that devoted to Saint Paul, for which we have documents perfectly historical, and may paint characters from the life and tell facts just as they took place, — we stand on firmer ground, while yet the general aspect of that period is none the clearer. Established facts speak louder than all biographical details. We know very little of those incomparable artists who created the masterpieces of Greek art. But these masterpieces tell us more of the person of their creators, and of the public that understood them, than could be told in the most circumstantial story or the best authenticated texts.

For the critical incidents that took place in the first days after the death of Jesus, our authorities are the closing chapters of the Gospels, which relate the apparitions of the risen Christ.[1] I need not repeat here what has been said in the Introduction to the "Life of Jesus" as to the historical value of such documents. In this portion of our history we are fortunate in having a parallel account which we too often lack in that which precedes. This is the very significant passage of Paul in "First Corinthians," xv. 5–8, which asserts: 1. The reality of the apparitions; 2. their long continuance, contrary to the account in the Gospels; 3. the several places where they took place, contrary to the accounts of Mark and Luke. A study of this fundamental text, with other considerations, confirms me in the view I have before expressed as to the relation of the Fourth Gospel to the Synoptics. Regarding the account of the resurrection and the apparitions, the Fourth Gospel retains its usual superiority over the other evangelists. It is here, if anywhere, that we should seek a connected and logical narrative, permitting a probable conjecture as to what, apart

[1] For the discussion and comparison of the several narratives, see Strauss, "Life of Jesus," sect. iii. chap. 4, 5; also his "New Life of Jesus," i. § 46 *et seq.*; ii. § 97 *et seq.*

from all illusions, really took place. Here I touch on the hardest question of all, referring to the beginnings of Christian history, — What is the historical value of the Fourth Gospel? The use made of it in my "Life of Jesus" is the point of most of the objections raised by my enlightened critics. Almost all scholars who deal with the history of religious opinion by a rational method reject the Fourth Gospel as wholly apocryphal. I have carefully reviewed my ground as to this question, and have not shifted it to any noticeable extent. Still, as I vary from the common opinion upon this point, I have felt it my duty to set forth in detail the reasons for adhering to my former position. These reasons will be found in the Appendix to the later and revised editions of the "Life of Jesus."

The most important document for the period now under review is the "Acts of the Apostles." Here I must make clear my view regarding the character of this composition, its value as historical evidence, and the use which has been made of it.

Without doubt the book of "Acts" was written by the author of the Third Gospel, and is a continuation of it. This point needs no proof, and has never been seriously disputed.[1] The prefaces to these two documents, the dedication of each to Theophilus, and the perfect likeness in style and ideas, are ample proof.

Another point, not so certain but still quite probable, is that the writer of "Acts" was a companion of Paul, who attended him in many of his journeyings. At first glance, this view seems unquestionable. In many passages, beginning with xvi. 10, the writer uses in his account the pronoun "we," thus showing that, for the time at least, he was of the company gathered about Paul. This seems ample proof. The only escape from the force of this argument is to suppose the passages containing the pronoun "we" to have been

[1] It was early accepted by the Church as self-evident: see the Canon of Muratori (*Antiq. Ital.* iii. 854), collated by Wieseler and restored by Laurent (*Neutest. Studien*, Gotha, 1866), lines 33 *et seq.*

copied by the latest compiler of "Acts" from an earlier account in the memoir of some original disciple of Paul, — Timothy, for example, — the compiler neglecting to supply, in place of "we," the writer's name. This can hardly be admitted; such negligence would be intelligible only in the rudest of compilations. But the Third Gospel and the "Acts" form together a well-conceived work, composed with thought and skill, written by one hand upon a coherent plan.[1] The two, when put together, make up one whole, exactly in the same style, showing the same favourite expressions and the same way of quoting Scripture. So shocking a fault in composition as that supposed would be unaccountable. Thus we are irresistibly led to conclude that the beginning and end of the book were written by the same hand, and that he who has spoken in the first person in some passages is the author of the whole.

This becomes the more convincing when we call to mind the circumstances under which the narrator is found in Paul's company. This, as we have seen, is just when Paul is going over to Macedonia for the first time ("Acts" xvi. 10), and the expression "we" continues until his departure from Philippi. It is resumed when Paul, on his second visit to Macedonia, passes again through Philippi (*id.* xx. 5, 6), and after this, the writer remains with Paul to the end. If we remark, besides, that the chapters showing this companionship have a special character of precision, we no longer doubt that the writer was a Macedonian, probably of Philippi,[2] who preceded Paul to Troas on his second mission, remained at Philippi when the apostle left for Athens, and rejoined him for good when on his third mission he passed by way of Philippi. Can we suppose that a compiler, writing at a distance, allowed himself to be thus controlled by another man's recollections? These would only make an awkward patch upon the work. The writer speaking in the first person would have his own style, his peculiar forms of

[1] Compare the Introductions: Luke i. 1–4; Acts i. 1.

[2] See in particular Acts xvi. 12.

expression;[1] he would speak more after the manner of Paul than would the compiler. But this is not the case. The work is perfectly harmonious and self-consistent.

It may perhaps be matter of surprise that a point apparently so clear should ever have been doubted. But a critical study of the New Testament writings shows us many an example of apparent certainty which proves on examination to be full of doubt. Whether as to style, thought, or doctrine, we do not find in "Acts" what we should look for from a disciple of Paul. The book is in no respect like the Pauline epistles. Not a trace of that haughty assertion of opinion which gives to the Apostle of the Gentiles so marked originality. Paul's temperament is that of a Protestant, stiff and independent; the writer of "Acts" makes us think of a good Catholic, docile and optimistic, who speaks of every priest as "a holy priest," calls every bishop "a great bishop," and is ready to accept any fiction rather than admit that these holy priests and great bishops dispute among themselves with sharp attack and obstinate defence. While professing the highest admiration for Paul, the writer of "Acts" is careful not to give him the title of "apostle,"[2] and holds that it was Peter who first began the conversion of Gentiles. He may be termed, in short, a disciple of Peter rather than of Paul. It will soon appear that in more than one instance his conciliatory temper has led him seriously to distort the personal history of Paul; he is guilty of inaccuracies,[3] and still more of omissions, which would be strange indeed as coming from one of Paul's disciples.[4] He never speaks of one of the epistles, and he is strangely

[1] The poverty of expression with the writers of the New Testament, as we know, is such that each may be said to have his own limited vocabulary. This makes a serviceable rule in fixing the authorship of the briefer compositions.

[2] In chap. xiv. 4, 14, where Paul and Barnabas are called "apostles," the expression is loose and indirect.

[3] Compare Acts xvii. 14–16, xviii. 5, with 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 32; 2 Cor. i. 8; xi. 23–28; Rom. xv. 19; xvi. 3–7.

silent on points most requiring explanation.[1] Even when he would seem to have been Paul's companion, he is sometimes curiously dry, ill-informed, and unobservant.[2] In short, the smooth vagueness of certain portions, the conventional tone observable here and there, would lead us to suppose a writer who had nothing to do with the Apostles, directly or indirectly, but wrote somewhere about the year 100 or 120.

Should we stop short at these objections? I do not think so. I still hold that the latest compiler of "Acts" is really the disciple of Paul, who says "we" in the final chapters. All the difficulties, unanswerable as they may seem, should be at least held in suspense, if not wholly put aside by a consideration so decisive as the use of "we." Further, in ascribing this book to a companion of Paul, we throw light on two essential points: first, the disproportion of parts, more than three-fifths of the entire book being devoted to Paul alone; and again, a like disproportion in Paul's own life, his first mission being treated with extreme brevity, while the second and third, and especially his last journeyings, are told in minute detail. A writer wholly unfamiliar with the apostolic story would surely not have been thus unequal. His work would have been better planned as a whole. A history constructed from written documents is distinguished from a history wholly or in part original by this very disproportion. The closet-historian takes for his ground-plan events as they have actually occurred; the writer of memoirs takes for his ground-plan his own recollections, or at least his personal relations. A church historian, writing about 120, would have left us a book quite differently put together from that which we find in "Acts" after the thirteenth chapter. The strange way in which the book quits at this point the orbit in which it has hitherto revolved, can, as I think, be explained only by the special position of the writer, and his relations with Paul. And this view will be strengthened if, among the known fellow-

[1] Thus, compare Acts xvi. 6; xviii. 22, 23, with Galatians.

[2] Thus the stay at Cæsarea is left quite in the dark.

labourers of Paul, we find the name of the writer to whom tradition has ascribed this book.

This is in fact the case. Tradition and manuscript authority both name as author of the Third Gospel one Lucanus[1] or Lucas. From what has been already said it follows that, if Lucas is really the writer of the Third Gospel, he is equally the writer of "Acts." Now this name is found as that of a companion of Paul in "Colossians," iv. 14, in "Philemon," ver. 24, and in "Second Timothy," iv. 11. The last is of more than doubtful genuineness. "Colossians" and "Philemon," again, though probably genuine, are yet not among the more unquestioned writings of Paul. But in any case, these epistles belong to the first century; and that is enough to prove, without question, that there was a Lucas among Paul's disciples. The composer of the epistles to Timothy was, at any rate, not the same with the composer of those to the Colossians and to Philemon, — supposing these latter to be apocryphal, which I do not think. It is little likely that the author of a forged document would have attributed to Paul an imaginary companion; certainly different forgers would not have happened upon the same name. Two observations greatly strengthen this view. First, the name Lucas or Lucanus is very rare among the earliest Christians, so that we are never led to confuse two of that name; secondly, the "Luke" of the epistles has no celebrity apart from this mention. To put a well-known name at the head of a composition, — as was done with the second epistle of Peter, and (very probably) with the Pauline epistles to Timothy and Titus, — was in no way repugnant to the manner of the time. But to put to such use a name not only false but obscure, would be inconceivable. Was it the intention of the falsifier to give his book the authority of Paul? But then why not take Paul's own name, or at least that of Timothy or Titus, who were far better known as his disciples? Luke had no standing in tradition, legend, or history. The three passages of

[1] Mabillon, *Museum Italicum*, i. 109.

the epistles just referred to could not, of themselves, give him a warrant accepted by everybody. The epistles to Timothy and Titus were probably written later than "Acts." The mentions of Luke in "Colossians" and "Philemon" are in truth but one, since both these epistles make up one message. I think, then, that the writer of the Third Gospel and of "Acts" is really Luke, the disciple of Paul.

This very name, Luke or Lucan, and the character of physician held by Paul's disciple of that name (Col. iv. 14), well correspond with the hints as to authorship to be found in the books themselves. It has been shown above (page 7) that the writer of the Third Gospel and of "Acts" was probably from Philippi, a Roman colonial town, where the Latin element predominated.[1] Besides, this writer was ill-informed as to Judaism and matters in Palestine;[2] he knew little of Hebrew;[3] he was acquainted with the ideas of the pagan world, as we see in his speech at Athens (chap. xvii. 22–28), and writes Greek quite correctly. He wrote at a distance from Judæa for persons ill-acquainted with its topography,[4] who cared nothing for rabbinical learning or Hebrew names.[5] His leading idea is that, if the common people had been free to follow their own choice, they would have embraced the faith of Jesus, but were prevented by the

[1] Almost all the inscriptions at Philippi, and at Neapolis (Cavala) are in Latin (Heuzey, Mission de Macédoine, p. 11). The acquaintance with seamanship shown by the writer of "Acts," especially in chaps. xxvii. xxviii., would suggest that he was from Neapolis.

[2] See Acts v. 36, 37; x. 28.

[3] The hebraisms of his style might come from the diligent reading of the Old Testament in Greek translations, and particularly of writings composed by his fellow-religionists in Palestine, whom he copied word for word. His citations from the Old Testament (as in Acts xv. 16, 17) are made without knowledge of the original.

[4] See Luke i. 26; iv. 31; xxiv. 13; and compare the note on Emmaus in chap. i., below.

[5] Luke i. 31, compared with Matt. i. 21. The name Joanna, known only to Luke, is very doubtful. There seems to have been at this time no female name corresponding to John (but see Babyl. Talm., *Sota*, 22 *a*).

Jewish aristocracy.[1] The word "Jew" is always taken by him in ill part, as synonymous with "enemy of the Christians,"[2] while he appears well disposed to the heretical Samaritans.[3]

To what date can we refer this important document? Luke first appears in Paul's company during his first journey to Macedonia, about A. D. 52. Suppose him to have been at this time twenty-five years old, there would be nothing unusual if he were living at the end of the century. The narrative of "Acts" closes in 63. But its composition was evidently later than that of the Third Gospel, whose date is pretty certainly fixed in the years immediately following the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70).[4] The composition of "Acts" cannot, therefore, have been earlier than 71 or 72.

We might rest here if it were sure that "Acts" was written directly after the Gospel. But here is room for doubt. We are led to think that there was some interval between the two. In fact, we note a marked contradiction between the last chapters of the Gospel and the first of "Acts." In the former the ascension of Jesus would seem to have taken place on the same day with the resurrection;[5] while in the latter ("Acts" i. 3, 9), it is stated to have been forty days later. This last shows us clearly a more developed form of the legend, suggested doubtless by the need of finding space for the several apparitions, and giving full and logical sequence to the events following the entombment. This new mode of conception, as we may suppose, did not occur to the writer before the interval between the two compositions. In any event, it is singular that the writer, a few lines later on, finds himself obliged to expand the earlier narrative, adding

[1] Acts ii. 47; iv. 33; v. 13, 26.

[2] Acts ix. 22, 23; xii. 3, 11; xiii. 45, 50, and many other passages. It is the same with the Fourth Gospel, which also was composed away from Syria.

[3] Luke x. 33–35; xvii. 16; Acts viii. 5–8. So in the Fourth Gospel: John iv. 5–30, as contrasted with Matt. x. 5, 6.

[4] See "Life of Jesus," Introd. p. 45.

[5] Luke xxiv. 50; so too in Mark xvi. 19.

further circumstances. If the former composition was still in hand, why not make in that those additions which, separated as they are, have so awkward a look? Still, this is not conclusive; and the preface to the Gospel, which seems common to both books, — especially the phrase, "things most surely received among us," — might well make us think that Luke conceived the plan as a whole from the outset. The contradiction just indicated may, it is true, be explained as simply neglect to give a strict record of the times, whence the several accounts of what befell after the resurrection are in such complete disaccord. Accurate history was so little cared for that there was no scruple in setting forth, one after the other, two views of the event irreconcilably at variance. The three accounts of Paul's conversion — in chapters x. xxii., and xxvi. — show also slight variations, which prove merely the writer's disregard of accurate detail.

We shall not be far from the fact if we suppose the book of "Acts" to have been composed about A. D. 80. The spirit of the book answers well to the early years of the Flavian emperors. The writer seems to shun everything that might offend the Romans. He likes to show how Roman officials favoured the new sect, sometimes even joined it, — as in the case of the centurion Cornelius, and of the proconsul Sergius Paulus; how they at least protected it against the Jews, how equitable was imperial justice, and how superior to the passions of local powers.[1] He particularly insists on the advantage which Paul found in his claim to Roman citizenship.[2] He cuts his narrative short off at the moment of Paul's arrival at Rome, apparently so as not to have to relate the cruelties of Nero toward the Christians.[3] The Apocalypse shows a striking contrast.

[1] See Acts xiii. 6–12 [at Paphos]; xviii. 12–17 [at Corinth]; xix. 35–41 [at Ephesus]; xxiv. 7, 17 [at Jerusalem]; xxv. 9, 16, 25 [before Festus]; xxvii. 2; xxviii. 17, 18 [at Rome].

[2] Acts xvi. 37–40; xxii. 26–29.

[3] These precautions were not rare. The Apocalypse and First Peter speak of Rome in disguised phrase [as "Babylon"].

Written in the year 68, — four years after the Neronian persecution, and amid the agonies of the Jewish terror, — it is full of the memories of Nero's enormities, full of a deadly and despairing hate against Rome. Here, on the contrary, we find a man of gentle temper, who lives in a season of calm. From about the year 70 until the end of the first century, the situation was fairly favourable to the Christians. Members of the Flavian household were found in their community. Who knows but that Luke was acquainted with Flavius Clemens, — nay, even one of his household; whether the "Acts" were not written for this potent magistrate, whose official rank demanded some reverence of speech? Certain indications have led to the belief that the book was written at Rome, and that the conditions of life to the church in Rome weighed heavily on the author. This church had from the first the political and hierarchal character which has belonged to it ever since. Luke, a man of kindly spirit, may well have been influenced by this. His ideas on church authority are very advanced: we see already sprouting in him the germs of the episcopate. He writes history in the tone of an apologist at all hazards, — which is just that of the official historians of the Roman See. He does just what an Ultramontane of the time of Clement XIV. would have done, — one who would praise alike the pope and the Jesuits, and would fain persuade us, by an emotional tale, that the rules of brotherly love are equally kept on both sides in the debate. In two centuries more it will be held that Cardinal Antonelli and his bitter opponent, M. de Mérode, loved each other like brothers. The writer of "Acts" — with a simple good faith no longer found — was the first of these "reconciling" narrators, blissfully content with the situation, and resolute to find all within the Church going on in true gospel-fashion. Too loyal to condemn his master Paul, too orthodox not to side with the official opinion then prevalent, he wipes out the difference of doctrine so as to show only the common end in view, which these exalted founders pursued by paths so opposite and through rivalries so keen.

Now it is clear that one who has committed himself on system to such a determination of mind is the least capable of men to exhibit things as they really were. To historic fidelity he is quite indifferent; edification is all he really cares for. Luke makes no secret of this. He writes that Theophilus may "know the certainty of those things he has been instructed in by the catechist" [κατηχήθης]. It thus appears that there was already a system of church history agreed upon and officially taught, whose groundwork, as well as that of the Gospel story itself ("Acts" i. 22), was most likely already fixed. The leading trait in "Acts," as in the Third Gospel, is a tender piety, a warm sympathy for gentiles, — as shown in the story of Cornelius, — a reconciling temper, a great predilection for the supernatural, tenderness to the poor and humble, a strongly democratic feeling, — or rather a persuasion that the common people are naturally Christians, prevented only by the rich and mighty from following their right, proper instincts, — an exalted notion of the power of the Church and its leaders, with a very remarkable inclination to communistic life.[1] The methods of composition are likewise the same in the two works, so that, regarding the apostolic history, we are just where we should be regarding the gospel narrative if the Gospel according to Luke were our only text.

The disadvantage of this position is evident. The life of Jesus, as derived from the Third Gospel alone, would be extremely defective and incomplete. This we understand, because for the life of Jesus the comparison can actually be made. Along with Luke, we have — to say nothing of the Fourth Gospel — both Matthew and Mark, who, as compared with Luke, are (in part at least) original authorities. We put our finger on that very violent process by which Luke rends anecdotes apart or mixes them together, the way in which he alters the colouring of certain facts to fit his personal

[1] These traits will appear in the following passages: Acts ii. 44, 45–47; iv. 33, 34–37; v. 1–11 (story of Ananias and Sapphira), 13, 26: comp. Luke xxiv. 19, 20.

view, the pious legends which he has appended to the more authentic tradition. Is it not clear that we should find the like defects and errors in the "Acts" if we could make the like comparison? The earlier chapters would most likely appear to us even inferior to "Luke," since they were probably composed from fewer and less universally received authorities.

Here, indeed, a fundamental difference is to be admitted. In respect of historic value, we find "Acts" divided into two portions, one containing the first twelve chapters and relating the more important events in the history of the primitive Church, while the other contains the sixteen remaining chapters, which are wholly devoted to the missions of Paul. In the second portion, again, are two classes of narrative: in one the narrator gives himself out as an eye-witness of the facts; in the other he only reports what he has been told. Even in the latter case his authority is unquestionably great, his information often coming from Paul's own conversations. Especially towards the close, the narration has a surprisingly precise and lifelike air. The last pages of "Acts" are, in fact, the only passages completely historical in all the early Christian history. The earlier ones, on the contrary, are the most vulnerable in all the New Testament. It is especially here that the writer yields to the preconceived opinions which he follows in his Gospel, and here they are even more misleading. His theory of the forty days; his account of the ascension of Jesus, closing that life of wonders with a mysterious disappearance and a certain theatrical pomp; his manner of relating the descent of the Spirit and the inspired address which follows; his way of understanding the "gift of tongues," so different from that of Paul,[1] — in all these we discern the preconceived opinions of a lower period, when the legend is already full-grown, and, as it were, rounded out to its complete proportions. Everything, with this writer, goes on with a singular stage effect, and a great display of

[1] Compare Mark xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4, 13; x. 46; xi. 15; xix. 6, with 1 Cor. chaps. xii.–xiv.

the marvellous. We must recollect that he writes a full half-century after the events, far from the region where they took place, about facts which he has not seen, which his instructor is just as ignorant of as he, following traditions partly fabulous or at least transfigured. Not only Luke belongs to another generation than the first founders of Christianity: he is of another world; he is a Hellenist, hardly at all a Jew, almost a stranger to Jerusalem and the inner life of Judaism; he was never in touch with the primitive Christian community; he has known scarce anything of its later representatives. In the miracles he relates we seem to find outright inventions rather than a transforming of real facts, those ascribed to Peter and to Paul making two successions of corresponding incidents.[1] The leading characters are just alike: Peter noway differs from Paul, or Paul from Peter. The discourses put in the mouth of one or another Christian orator, though skilfully adapted to the circumstances, are all in the same style, and belong more to the historian than to the speaker. They even contain impossibilities, — as when Gamaliel, about A. D. 36, speaks of Theudas, whose revolt is expressly said (v. 36, 37) to have been earlier than that of Judas the Gaulonite, being in fact as late as 44, while that of the Gaulonite was some time before.[2] "Acts," in short, is a dogmatic history, shaped to confirm the orthodox opinion of the day, or to instil the views most harmonious with the writer's piety. I may add that it could not well be otherwise. The birth of a religion is known only through the accounts given by its believers.

[1] Compare Acts iii. 2–10 [healing of the lame man at the Temple] with xvi. 8–12 [the cripple at Lystra]; ix. 36–40 [raising of Tabitha] with xx. 9–12 [revival of Eutychus]; v. 1–11 [story of Ananias and Sapphira] with xiii. 8–12 [blindness of Elymas]; v. 15, 16 [miracles at Jerusalem] with xix. 11, 12 [at Ephesus]; xii. 7–11 [deliverance of Peter] with xvi. 26–34 [Paul at Philippi]; x. 44 with xix. 6 [gifts of the Spirit to gentiles].

[2] Compare Josephus, *Antiq.* xx. 5: 1 with id. xviii. 1: 1, and *War*, ii. 8: 1.

It is only the critical inquirer, the "sceptic," who writes history for the sake of giving the facts (*ad narrandum*).

These are not mere suspicions, conjectures of a too distrustful criticism. They are solid inductions. Wherever we have it in our power to check the narrative of "Acts," we find it deceptive and composed upon a theory. The check which we cannot seek in the synoptic Gospels we may look for in Paul's epistles, especially in "Galatians." It is evident that, where the "Acts" and the Epistles disagree, the preference must always be given to the latter, whose text is absolutely genuine, is the older, is perfectly single-minded, and is unaffected by legend. In history, a document is of the more weight in proportion to its lack of historic form. The authority of all chronicles must yield before that of a single inscription, medal, charter, or genuine epistle. In this view, letters of a known writer, or of a sure date, are the very foundation of the earliest Christian history. Without these, it may be said that the very life of Jesus would be assailed and overwhelmed by doubt. Now, in two very important particulars, the epistles throw strong light on the personal motives and views of the writer of "Acts," and on his desire to obliterate every trace of the divisions that existed between Paul and the apostles at Jerusalem.[1]

At the outset, the writer of "Acts" represents Paul, after the events at and near Damascus (ix. 19–25; xxii. 17–21), as having come to Jerusalem, while his conversion was still almost unknown; as having made the acquaintance of the apostles and lived with them and the brethren on terms of cordial intimacy; as having disputed publicly with the Hellenistic Jews; and as compelled by a plot fomented by them against him, and by a revelation from heaven, to with-

[1] Those unable to follow in detail the studies of the German critics — Baur, Schneckenburger, De Witte, Schwegler, and Zeller — on the questions bearing on Acts, and leading to a more or less definite solution, will find advantage in the writings of Stap (*Études historiques*), Nicolas (*Études critiques*), Reuss (*Hist. de la théol. Chrétienne*), and various essays of Kayser, Scherer, and Reuss, in the *Revue de Théologie* (Strasburg, 1 Ser. vols. ii., iii.; 2 Ser. vols. ii., iii.)

draw from Jerusalem. Now Paul himself tells us that the course of events was wholly different. To prove that he is not indebted to the Twelve, but to Jesus alone, for his doctrine and mission, he asserts (Gal. i. 11–17) that after his conversion he took no counsel with any one whatever,[1] and did not go near Jerusalem or to those who were apostles before him; that he went and preached in Hauran of his own accord, without waiting any one's commission; that three years later, indeed, he took the journey to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Cephas; that he remained with him fifteen days, but saw no other apostle excepting James "the Lord's brother," so that his face was unknown to the churches of Judæa. Here we plainly see an attempt to smooth away the asperities of the rude apostle, to represent him as labouring together with the Twelve, and acting in concert with them at Jerusalem. Jerusalem is made his capital and his point of departure. His doctrine is made out to be so exactly identical with that of the Twelve that he can, in some sense, take their place in the office of preaching. His first apostleship is carried back to the synagogues at Damascus, and he is represented as having been a hearer and disciple, which he assures us on oath he never was.[2] The interval between his conversion and first visit to Jerusalem is shortened, and his stay in Jerusalem — where he preaches to the general satisfaction — is lengthened out. It is asserted that he lived on terms of intimacy with the apostles, though he himself assures us that he saw only two of them. The brethren at Jerusalem are represented as watching over him, while he declares that they did not so much as know his face.

The same desire to exhibit Paul as an assiduous visitor in Jerusalem which induced the writer to anticipate and prolong his first stay in this place after his conversion,

[1] "I conferred not with flesh and blood." For the shade of meaning here implied, compare Matt. xvi. 17: "flesh and blood hath not revealed it."

[2] "Before God I lie not," Gal. 1. 20. Read the whole of the first and second chapters.

seems to have led to the interpolating of one more missionary journey. According to this account, Paul came to Jerusalem with Barnabas, to carry a charitable gift to the brethren during the famine of 44 (xi. 30; xii. 25). Now Paul expressly declares in "Galatians" (chaps. i. and ii.) that he never once went to Jerusalem between the time of his first visit, three years after his conversion, and that made [about 50] to discuss the question of circumcision, — thus formally denying any such journey between "Acts" ix. 26 and xv. 2. If, against all reason, one should deny that the journey spoken of in the second chapter of "Galatians" is the same with that mentioned in the fifteenth of "Acts," the contradiction remains equally explicit. "Three years after my conversion," says Paul, "I went up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Cephas. Fourteen years later I went again to Jerusalem." We may doubt here whether the "fourteen years" are to be reckoned from his conversion, or from the journey taken three years after it. Taking the former supposition, which is the more favourable to the account in "Acts," there would then be at least eleven years, according to Paul, between his first and second visit to Jerusalem. But, surely, there are not eleven years between the account in "Acts" ix. 26–30 and the incident told in xi. 30. Or, if this should be maintained, against all probability, we should then run against another impossibility. The incident in "Acts" xi. 30 is contemporaneous with the death of James, the son of Zebedee (xii. 1), which gives us the only sure date in the entire book, since it took place just before the death of Herod Agrippa I., which was in the year 44.[1] Since Paul's second visit was at least fourteen years after his conversion, if he had really made it in 44, this would carry back the date of his conversion to A. D. 30, which is absurd.[2] It is thus impossible to hold, as fact, to the journey related in "Acts" xi. 30, xii. 25.

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* xix. 8: 2; *War*, ii. 12: 6.

[2] This absurdity is, however, accepted by Harnack, who makes it the point of departure for his chronology of the New Testament writings (1896). — ED.

These comings and goings seem to have been very inaccurately related. Comparing "Acts" xvii. 14–16, xviii. 5 with 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, — concerning the presence of Silas and Timothy with Paul at Corinth, — we find another disagreement. But, as this does not turn on any point of doctrine, I pass it by.

As bearing on the subject now in hand, the historical value of the "Book of Acts," a decisive light is thrown by a comparison of the passages in "Acts" xv. and "Galatians" ii., relating to the question of circumcision. According to the former, when certain brethren from Judæa had come to Antioch [where Paul was preaching], and insisted on the need of circumcising pagan converts, a deputation consisting of Paul, Barnabas, and sundry others, was sent to Jerusalem to consult the apostles and elders on the subject. Here they were warmly welcomed by everybody, and a great assembly was held. Scarcely any difference of opinion appears, smothered as it was under the effusive brotherly love of all parties and the joy of finding themselves in company. Peter sets forth the opinion which we might have expected from the lips of Paul, — namely, that pagan converts are not subject to the Mosaic code. To this opinion James makes only a slight reservation.[1] Paul does not speak at all, and in truth has no need to speak, since his own opinion is put into Peter's mouth. No one defends the view of the Jewish brethren. A formal decision is made in conformity with that of James; and this decision is forwarded to the churches by deputies expressly chosen for that purpose.

Now let us compare the account given by Paul in "Galatians." He represents that his journey to Jerusalem at this time was undertaken of his own motion, and was even prompted by a revelation. Coming to Jerusalem, he imparts his gospel to those entitled to such communication; in particular, he has interviews with those who appear to be men

[1] His citation of Amos ix. 11, 12, quoting the Greek version, which varies from the Hebrew, clearly shows that this speech is a fabrication of the writer.

of importance. No criticism whatever is passed upon him; no communication is made to him; nothing is required of him; he is only counselled to keep in mind the poor of Jerusalem. If Titus, who is with him, submits to be circumcised,[1] it is out of regard for certain "false brethren who have intruded." Paul makes the passing concession, but in no way yields to them. As to those "who seem to be pillars," — Paul always speaks of these men with a shade of irony, — they have taught him nothing new. Still further, when Cephas came afterwards to Antioch, Paul "withstood him to his face, because he was in the wrong." At first, indeed, Cephas ate with all, making no distinction; but, on the coming of emissaries from James, he holds himself aloof, avoiding those uncircumcised. "Seeing that he did not walk in the straight path of the gospel truth," Paul publicly appeals to him, and reproves him sharply for his conduct.

We see the difference. By one account there is a formal agreement; by the other, there is bitterness ill-suppressed and excessive touchiness. In one there is a sort of council; in the other, nothing like it. In one, a formal decree given out by a recognized authority; in the other, differing opinions fronting one another, with no yielding on either side except, it may be, for form's sake. It is needless to say which account is to be preferred. That in "Acts" is scarcely probable, since according to this the occasion of the council is a dispute, of which we see not a trace as soon as the council is got together. The two speakers express themselves in a way quite opposed to what we know from other sources to have been their real position. The decree which the counsel is stated to have passed is certainly pure fiction. If this decree, which James is said to have dictated, was really proclaimed, whence those moods of the timid and soft-hearted Peter before the envoys sent by James? Why does he keep in the dark? He and the Christians of Antioch were acting

[1] I shall show hereafter that this is the true sense of the passage. In any case, a doubt as to the fact, whether he was circumcised or not, does not touch the present line of argument.

in perfect agreement with the decree whose terms were fixed by James himself. This affair of circumcision took place about 51. A few years later, about 56, the dispute that should have been ended by this decree is hotter than ever. The Church of Galatia is troubled by new emissaries sent from the Jewish party at Jerusalem.[1] Paul replies to this new attack by his stormy epistle. If the decree reported in the fifteenth chapter of "Acts" had any real existence, Paul needed only to refer to it to put a stop to the debate; but all that he says assumes that there was no such decree. In 57, writing to the Corinthians, Paul again ignores the decree and violates its terms. It had required abstinence from meats sacrificed to idols; but Paul, on the contrary, holds that such meats may very well be eaten if no one is scandalised thereby, while in case of scandal they should be avoided.[2] In 58, again, during Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, James is more obstinate than ever.[3] One of the characteristic features of "Acts," proving that the writer has it less in view to give the historical truth or even a coherent story than to serve the edification of pious readers, is this very thing, that the question of admitting the uncircumcised is always being decided and never settled. It turns up first in the case of baptising the chamberlain of Queen Candace, then in that of the centurion Cornelius, — both miraculously prescribed; then in the founding of the church at Antioch (xi. 19–21); then in the fictitious council at Jerusalem, — all which does not prevent the question being in suspense among the latest events of the book (xxi. 20, 21). In truth, it always remained in suspense. The two parties of the primitive church were never fused together. The only settlement was that the party which kept the Jewish usages remained sterile and went out in the dark. Paul was so far from being accepted by all, that after his death a Christian party — especially the

[1] Compare Acts xv. 1. with Gal. i. 7; ii. 12.
[2] 1 Cor. viii. 4, 9; x. 25–29.
[3] Acts xxi. 20–25.

Ebionites — still anathematised him and hounded him with its calumnies.[1]

The fundamental question involved in these curious incidents will be fully treated in the volume of this series entitled "Saint Paul." I have desired to give here only a few specimens of the way in which the writer of "Acts" understands history, — his system of conciliation and his preconceived ideas. Are we to conclude from this that the earlier chapters of his work are devoid of authority, as some eminent critics think? that fiction here goes so far as to make "out of the whole cloth" such characters as the chamberlain of Queen Candace, the centurion Cornelius, and even the protomartyr Stephen and the pious Tabitha? So I by no means think. It is likely that the writer has not invented a single person of the story, though I should be glad to abandon Ananias and Sapphira, but he is a skilful advocate who writes to prove his point, and who takes advantage of things he has heard spoken of to argue for his favourite positions: namely, the lawfulness of the calling of the gentiles and the divine establishment of the hierarchy. Such a document requires to be used with extreme care; but to reject it absolutely is as uncritical as it would be to follow it blindly. And besides, some paragraphs even of the earliest portion have a value which all admit, as representing authentic memoirs culled by the late compiler. The substance of the twelfth chapter, in particular, is of genuine value, and would seem to have come from John Mark.

It is obvious what our difficulty would be if we had for the materials of our history only a book so legendary. Happily we have other sources, which (it is true) bear more directly upon the topic of a later volume, but throw much light meanwhile upon this. These are the epistles of Saint Paul. That to the Galatians, especially, is a genuine storehouse of information, the groundwork of all the chronology of this period, the master-key that unlocks every door, a

[1] See the Pseudo-Clementine *Homilies;* Irenæus, *Adv. hær.* i. 26: 2; Epiphanius, *Adv. hær.* xxx.; Jerome, *In Matt.* xii.

testimony which must give confidence even to the most sceptical as to the reality of things that might be held in doubt. I beg the candid reader, who might be tempted to regard me as too venturesome or too credulous, to read over again the first two chapters of this remarkable epistle. They are, without any doubt whatever, the two most important pages that exist regarding the early Christian history. One incomparable advantage, indeed, the writings of Paul possess as touching this history: namely, that they are absolutely genuine. No question has ever been raised by serious criticism against the genuineness of "Galatians," of "First" and "Second Corinthians," or of "Romans." The grounds on which the two epistles to the Thessalonians and that to the Philippians have been assailed are worthless. The more specious though still indecisive objections raised against "Colossians" and "Philemon," the special problem offered in "Ephesians," and the strong reasons for rejecting the epistles to Timothy and Titus will be considered in the introduction to my third volume. Those which I shall have occasion to use in this volume are unquestionably genuine; or, at least, inferences which may be drawn from the others are independent of any question whether they were or were not dictated by Paul himself.

There is no need to repeat here what has already been said in the Introduction to the "Life of Jesus," of the rules of criticism followed in this work. The first twelve chapters of "Acts" are, in fact, a document of the same class with the Synoptic Gospels, and are to be treated in the same way. Such compositions are half historic, half legendary, and cannot be treated as if they were strictly one or the other. Almost everything in them is untrue in detail, and yet one may infer from them inestimable truths. Merely to translate these tales is not to write history. In many cases they are, in fact, contradicted by better authorities. Consequently, even where we have but a single text, we always have ground to fear lest this might be disproved if we had others. In relating the ministry of Jesus, "Luke" is constantly checked and

corrected by the other Synoptic Gospels and by the Fourth. Is it not likely, I ask again, that if we had the means of similar comparison, "Acts" would be put in the wrong on many points as to which we have no other testimony? The case will be quite different when I come to speak of Paul, when we shall be in the field of positive history, and have in hand materials both original and at times autobiographical. When Paul himself tells us the story of some incident in his life, which he had no interest to set in this or that particular light, it is clear that our proper business is to copy his own statement word for word, as Tillemont has done. But when we have to do with a narrator who takes his personal view for granted, and writes in order to give currency to particular ideas, — touching up his story in this childish way, with outlines vague and soft, with colours hard and fixed, such as legend always shows, — the critic's duty is not to keep to the text; it is rather to attempt the discovery of what truth may be in the story, without being ever sure that he has found it. To deny to the critic the employment of such a method would be as irrational as to require an astronomer to confine himself to the visible aspect of the sky. Is it not, on the contrary, the very business of astronomy to allow for the angle of sight (parallax) caused by the observer's position, and thus construct the actual condition from that which is only apparent?

And then, how pretend to follow to the letter documents which contain impossibilities? The first twelve chapters of "Acts" are a tissue of miracles. Now an absolute rule of criticism is to give no place to the miraculous in an historical recital. This is not a rule imposed by any philosophic system; it is purely a matter of observation. Facts of that class are not capable of proof. All asserted miracles when brought to the test are resolved into illusion or imposture. If a single miracle were proved, we could not reject in a mass all those of ancient historians; for, granting that ever so many of them are false, we might still admit that some of them may be true. But it is not so. All miracles that can

be tested vanish. Are we not right, then, in asserting that miracles hundreds of years away, which cannot thus be challenged, are equally unreal? In other words, there is no miracle excepting where it is believed: the supernatural is the creation of faith. Catholicism, which asserts that the power of miracle still remains within it, yields to the influence of this law. The miracles it claims to work do not happen where they are needed. With such an easy way of proof, why not bring them out into the daylight? A miracle at Paris, before a competent body of scientists, would put an end to so many doubts. But, alas! this never happens. Never a miracle in presence of the public needing to be convinced, I mean the sceptics. The one essential condition is the credulity of the witness. No such thing has ever been done in view of those who could discuss and question it. To this there is not a single exception. Cicero, with his usual good sense and keenness, said (De div. ii. 57), "How long is it since this mysterious power disappeared? Was it not when men became less credulous?"

"But," you may say, "if it is impossible to prove that a supernatural fact ever happened, it is equally impossible to prove that it never did. The scientist who denies the supernatural does it just as gratuitously as the believer who asserts it." Not at all. The burden of proof is with the one who asserts. He to whom the assertion is made has only to wait for proof, and yield to that if it is sound. If Buffon were told to make room in his "Natural History" for sirens and centaurs, he would have said, "Show me a centaur or a siren, and I will let them in, but till then they do not exist for me." "But prove that they do not exist!" "It is for you to prove that they do." In matters of science, the burden of proof is with those who assert the fact. Why do men no longer believe in angels or demons, though numberless historic documents speak of them? Because their existence has never been shown to be a fact.

To uphold the reality of miracle, appeal is made to phenomena which, it is said, could not have taken place in the

regular course of nature, — the creation of man for example. This, it is claimed, could never have come to pass without the direct intervention of the Deity; and why may not this intervention have taken place at other critical moments of the universal evolution? I do not urge the strange philosophy and the petty notion of a Deity implied in this reasoning, for history must have its method independent of any philosophy. Without entering in the least upon the ground of theodicy, it is easy to show the defect of such reasoning. It is the same as to say that anything is miraculous which no longer comes to pass in the present system of things, or which cannot be explained in the present condition of our science. But then the sun is a miracle, since science is far from having explained the sun; so is conscious intelligence, or an act of conception, since both are to us pure mystery; every living thing is a miracle, for the origin of life is a problem as to which we have at present hardly any data. If we reply that all life, all mind, is of an order above nature, we but play with words. We are quite willing to understand it so; but then you must explain what you mean by miracle. What manner of miracle is that which happens every day and every minute? Miracle is not the unexplained; it is a formal exclusion from the general law by a special act of will. What we deny is the miracle as an exception from the common rule; as a particular intervention, as if a clockmaker should make a very fine clock, which he must put his hand into from time to time, to remedy the lack of a proper wheel. That God is continually in all things, especially in all that lives, is precisely what I think. I only say that exceptional interventions of supernal power have never been properly verified. I deny the reality of the special supernatural act until a fact of that sort has been duly proved. To look for such an act before the creation of man, — to flee, in order to shun inquiry into the miracles of history, beyond the field of history, where investigation is impossible, — is to take refuge behind a cloud; it is to explain an obscure thing by something still more obscure; it is to allege a known law to account

for an unknown fact. Miracles are appealed to which are asserted to have happened before there was any witness, because none can be alleged to which there is sufficient witness.

No doubt things have happened in the universe, in remote periods, which do not happen now, at least on the same scale. But they had their sufficient cause in the condition of things when they did happen. We find in the geological formations many minerals and gems which seem no longer to be naturally produced. Yet certain chemists —Mitscherlich, Ebelmen, Sénarmont, Daubrée — have artificially recomposed many of these minerals and gems. If we may still doubt their power to produce life artificially, this is because we can probably never, by any human means, bring back the circumstances under which life began, if it did begin. How restore a condition of the planet which passed away millions of years ago? How make an experiment that must last for centuries? Diversity of environment, centuries of slow evolution — these we forget when we call miraculous what took place in former time and never happens now. Very possibly, in some celestial body there may be going on things that have ceased in our world countless ages ago. Surely, the making of mankind is the most shocking thing in the world to our reason, if we think of it as sudden, instantaneous. Without ceasing to be mysterious, it withdraws into world-wide analogies as soon as we see it as the outcome of a slow, continuous advance lasting through incalculable periods of time. We cannot apply to embryonic life the laws of mature growth. The embryo develops its organs successively, one by one; the grown man no longer puts forth organs. He creates no longer, because he is past the creative stage, — as language is no longer invented because it is invented already. But why follow up an adversary who only begs the question? We demand a miracle of history clearly proved; our opponents answer by saying there were such before history began. Surely, if we needed proof that supernatural beliefs are required by certain conditions of mind, we should find

it in this, — that minds of clear perception in everything else can rest the edifice of their faith on so hopeless a course of reasoning.

Others, abandoning miracles of the physical order, fall back on that miracle of the moral order without which, as they assert, these events cannot be explained. Unquestionably, the growth of Christianity is the grandest fact in the religious history of mankind. Yet it is not a miracle. Buddhism and Bâbism have had their martyrs, as numerous, as exalted, as resigned, as those of Christianity. The miracles at the origin of Islamism were of another sort, and I admit that they impress me very little. Still, I may remark that the Moslem doctors argue upon the birth of Islam, its spread as by a sweep of flame, its swift conquests, and the force that gives it everywhere a sway so absolute, exactly as the Christian apologists do upon the founding of Christianity, claiming to show plainly the finger of God in it. Grant, if you insist, that the founding of Christianity is a fact wholly unique. Still, we find another wholly unique thing in Hellenism, understanding by this term the ideal of perfection in literature, art, and philosophy, realised by Greece. Greek art surpasses all other art as much as Christianity surpasses other religions. The Acropolis of Athens, a collection of masterpieces beside which all others are but awkward fumbling or more or less successful imitation, is perhaps the one thing which, in its own kind, most defies comparison. Hellenism, in other words, is as much a miracle of beauty as Christianity is a miracle of holiness. A thing unique is not of course a thing miraculous. God exists, in various degrees, in all that is beautiful, good, and true. But he exists in no one of his manifestations so exclusively as that the presence of his spirit in a religious or philosophical movement should be regarded as an exclusive or even an exceptional privilege.

I hope that the interval which has passed since the publication of the "Life of Jesus" may have brought certain readers to meet these questions in a cooler temper. Relig-

ious controversy is always touched with ill-faith, without either knowing or intending it. What it generally takes in hand is not impartial discussion or anxious search for truth, but to maintain a fixed opinion, or to make out the dissenter to be either ignorant or dishonest. To one who thinks he holds in his hand the interests of absolute truth nothing will come amiss, — calumny, prevarication, falsifying of opinions, misquotation of authorities, declamatory refutation of things the opponent never said, shouts of victory over errors of which he was never guilty. I should have been quite ignorant of history if I had not looked for this beforehand. I am cool-tempered enough not to be much hurt by it, and have a sufficiently keen perception in matters of faith to be warmly touched, at times, by the genuine feeling which has inspired my assailants. Often, when I have seen such innocency, such piety of assurance, anger so frankly uttered by such good and tender souls, have I said — like John Huss, when he saw an aged woman toiling to bring a fagot to his funeral pile, — "Ah, divine simplicity!" (*O sancta simplicitas!*) My regret has been only for certain expressions of temper which could not but be barren. In the noble words of Scripture, "God was not in the whirlwind." One might, indeed, well be comforted under so much uproar, if it all helped in the discovery of truth. But it is not so. Truth is not attainable for a mind disturbed by passion. It is held in reserve for those who seek it without prejudgment, unconstrained by fixed love or hate, with absolute mental freedom, and void of afterthought as to the effect of truth on human interests. Religious questions make only one class out of the vastly many which fill the world and make the occupation of the curious. It hurts nobody to express an opinion on a point of theory. Those who cling to their belief as a private treasure have a very easy way to protect it, — namely, to take no notice of anything that is written at variance with it. The timid in faith would do best not to read at all.

There are some, of a practical turn, who ask, concerning any new work of science, what political party the writer aims

to serve, or who insist that a poem shall teach a lesson of morality. Such persons do not consent that one shall write unless it be to preach. The idea of art or science, aiming only to find the true or realise the beautiful, apart from all interest of policy, is meaningless to them. Between such persons and ourselves misunderstanding cannot be avoided. "That sort of people," said a Greek philosopher, "take with the left hand what we give them with the right." A heap of letters which I have received, dictated (no doubt) by a worthy sentiment, amount to this: "But what did you want? What object would you gain?" Well, Heaven knows my motive was the same that one has in writing any history. If I had several lives to dispose of, I would spend one in writing a history of Alexander, another in writing that of Athens, a third in writing that of the French Revolution, or else, it may be, of the Franciscan Order. What end should I have in view in writing these? Only one: to discover the truth and make it live; to labour in making these great events of the past as truly known as possible, and in setting them forth in a manner worthy of them. The thought of disturbing any man's faith is thousands of miles away from me. Such tasks should be performed with as absolute impartiality as if one were writing for a deserted planet. Any concession to scruples on a lower level is to be recreant to the true service of art and truth. Who can fail to see that the lack of all motive to influence opinion is both the strength and the weakness of a work composed in such a spirit?

In short, the first principle of the critical school is this: that, in matters of faith, every man admits what he finds it needful to admit; that, so to speak, he shapes the bed of his beliefs in proportions to fit his own bulk and stature. Why should we be so senseless as to concern ourselves with what depends on circumstances which nobody can control? If any one accepts our principles, it is because he has the suitable turn of mind and education to accept them; all our efforts would not give this education or turn of mind to those who have them not. Philosophy differs from faith in this: that

faith is supposed to work of itself, independent of any understanding of the dogma which one receives. We think, on the other hand, that truth is of value only when a man has come to it of himself, when he has in view the whole order of ideas to which it belongs. We do not hold ourselves obliged to keep silence as to those of our beliefs which do not harmonise with those of some among our fellow-creatures. We do not sacrifice anything to the demands of the various orthodoxies. But no more do we think to challenge or to attack them. We simply act as if they were not. For my part, the day that I could be convicted of an attempt to bring over to my way of thinking a single disciple who did not come to it of his own accord, I should feel the keenest pain. I should infer that my mind has allowed itself to be disturbed from its free and quiet pace, or that some heavy weight has fallen upon my spirit, since I am no longer able to content myself with the glad contemplation of the universe.

And then, who does not see that, if my object had been to make war on established faiths, I ought to proceed in another way, — to attend only to pointing out the impossibilities and contradictions of the dogmas and texts held as sacred. This tiresome task has been done a thousand times, and well done. In 1856, in the preface to "Studies of Religious History," I wrote as follows: "I protest, once for all, against the false understanding of my labours which would be given by taking as polemical works the various essays I have published or may hereafter publish on the history of religions. Regarded as works of controversy, these essays would be very weak, as I am the first to acknowledge. Controversy requires a strategy which I am quite ignorant of: it needs that one should know how to select the weak point of his adversary's position, stick to that, never touch on matters of doubt, never concede anything; in other words, renounce all that is essential to the scientific spirit. That is not my method. The fundamental question on which religious discussion should turn, the question of revelation and the

supernatural, I never touch, — not that it is not settled in a way quite clear to my own mind, but because it is not a question of strict science; or rather, because independent science assumes it to be already closed. Indeed, were I to follow any end whatever of polemics or proselytism, it would be a capital error; it would be to carry over to the discussion of delicate and obscure problems a question which would be better treated in the loose terms of the ordinary controversialist or apologist. Far from regretting the loss of an advantage, I shall be glad of it if this may convince theologians that my writings are of another class than theirs; that they are to be regarded as essays of pure scholarship, exposed to attack as such, in which an attempt is made at times to apply to the Jewish and Christian religion the same principles of criticism that apply in other provinces of history and philology. As to discussions of pure theology, I shall never engage in them, any more than Burnouf, Creuzer, Guigniaut, and so many other critical historians of ancient beliefs have thought themselves obliged to undertake the refutation or defence of the religions they have dealt with. The history of mankind is to me a vast whole, in which all the particulars are irregular and diverse, but where all is of the same order, proceeds from the same causes, and obeys the same laws. These laws I investigate with no other intention than to discover the exact shape and colour of the fact. Nothing will induce me to exchange the obscure but fruitful path of science for the task of a controversialist, — an easy task, since it wins sure favour with those who think that war must be met with war. For this quarrel, which I am far from denying to be necessary, but which suits neither my taste nor my abilities, Voltaire is enough. Weak as he is in learning, void as he is of a true feeling for antiquity, in the eyes of those who have learned a better method, Voltaire is yet twenty times told victorious over adversaries still more devoid of critical faculty then he is himself. A new edition of this great writer's works would amply meet the need which the present moment seems to find, of meeting the

aggressions of theology, — a poor thing in itself, but suited to that which needs to be resisted; a belated retort to a belated science. Let us, who have in us the love and eager desire of the truth, do a better thing. Let us abandon these disputes to those who find pleasure in them. Let us toil for the small number of those who walk on the highway of human thought. I know that popularity comes more easily to the writers who, instead of pursuing the higher forms of truth, apply themselves to contending against the opinion of their day. But, in just recompense, they are no longer of any value as soon as the error they fought against has perished. Those who disproved magic and judicial astrology, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, have done vast service to human reason. Yet their writings are in our day wholly unknown; their very victory has caused them to be forgotten."

I shall hold invariably to this rule, the only one suited to the dignity of a man of letters. I well know that inquiries into religious history touch on living problems which seem to need solution. Those unfamiliar with free inquiry do not understand the calm leisure of thought; practical minds are impatient with science, which does not keep pace with their eager temper. Let us keep clear of this idle heat. Let us not aim to found anything new, but stay in our respective churches, profiting by their age-long culture and their tradition of holiness, sharing in their good works, and enjoying the poetry of their past. Let us shun only their intolerance; rather let us pardon that intolerance, since, like self-love, that is one of the needs of human nature. To suppose that new religious households are to be established in the future, or that among those which now exist one will ever gain much upon another, is to go against appearances. Catholicism will soon be tasked with great divisions; the times of Avignon and the Antipopes, of the Clementines and Urbanists, will come again, and the Catholic Church will have to repeat the story of the thirteenth century; but, in spite of its dissensions, it will remain the Catholic Church. It is likely that

in another hundred years, the numbers of the Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, will not have altered much. But a great change will be brought about, or rather will become evident to the eyes of all. Each of these religious groups will have two classes of adherents, — absolute believers, as in the Middle Age and those who sacrifice the letter, holding only to the spirit. The latter class will be more numerous in each communion; and, as the spirit brings men together as much as the letter holds them apart, those of the spirit in each communion will come so near together that they will care little for outward unity. Fanaticism will be lost in the general tolerance. Dogma will become a mysterious casket which by common consent will remain forever closed. If the casket is empty, what matters it? One religion alone, I fear, will resist this softening away of dogma, — Islamism. Among some few Moslems of the old school, among some men of distinction at Constantinople, and above all in Persia, there are germs of a broad and liberal spirit. If these are crushed by the fanaticism of the Ulemas, Islam will pass away. For two things are evident: that modern civilization does not wish that old faiths shall perish utterly; and that it will not submit to be hampered in its work by outgrown religious institutions. Those must yield or perish.

Why should pure religion meanwhile, whose claim it is to be neither a sect nor a church apart, suffer the inconvenience of a position of which it shares not the advantages? Why should it plant flag against flag, knowing as it does that salvation is free to all, depending on the intrinsic nobility of each man. In the sixteenth century, as we know, Protestantism was forced to an open rupture. It proceeded from a very positive conviction. Far from conforming to a weakening of dogma, the Reformation signalled a new birth of the most rigid Christian faith. The religious movement of the nineteenth century, on the contrary, sets out with a spirit the reverse of dogmatism; its outcome will not separate sects or churches, but will effect a general softening of rigour in every

church. Sharp divisions increase the fanaticism of orthodoxy and challenge reaction. The followers of Luther and Calvin found themselves confronted by a Caraffa, the Ghislierr, a Loyola, and Philip II. If our own church rejects us, let us not cry out against her. Let us take to heart the mildness of modern manners, which have made such hatred powerless. Let us find comfort in thinking of that church invisible which includes the excommunicated saints, the noblest souls of every age. Exiles from the Church are always the elect of their day. They anticipate the advance of time. The heretics of to-day are the orthodox of to-morrow. And then, what is man's excommunication? Our heavenly Father shuts out from his household only arid minds and narrow hearts. If the priest should refuse to us burial in hallowed ground, let us forbid our families to urge our claim. It is God that judges. The earth is a kindly mother, who receives her children with impartial embrace. A good man's body, cast into an unblessed corner, brings its own benediction.

Doubtless there are situations where these principles do not easily apply. The spirit "bloweth where it listeth," and the spirit is liberty. There are men fast bound, as it were, to absolute faith. I mean those engaged in sacred orders, or invested with the cure of souls. Even then, a noble heart finds a way. A worthy rural priest, we will suppose, comes by his solitary studies and the purity of his life to see the impossibility of literal dogma. Shall he grieve those whom he has hitherto consoled, or set forth before the unlearned changes which they can no way understand? Heaven forbid! There are no two men in the world whose duties are just alike. The excellent Bishop Colenso did an honest thing, such as the Church has not seen since the beginning, in writing out his doubts as soon as they became clear to him. But the humble Catholic priest, in a narrow-minded and timid district, must hold his peace. Many a faithful tomb, under the shadow of a rustic church, thus hides a poetic reserve, an angelic silence. Shall they whose duty it has been to

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

speak vie with the sanctity of these secrets known to God alone?[1]

Theory is not practice. The ideal must remain in the realm of ideality; it must needs dread a stain from too close touch with rude fact. Ideas which are good for those defended by their own nobility from any moral peril may be found injurious if thrust upon those who have any soil of baseness. Nothing great can be accomplished without some well-defined idea; for human power has its limits; and a man wholly without prepossession would be impotent. Let us enjoy our freedom [of thought] as sons of God, but let us have no hand in that weakening of virtue which would menace society itself if Christianity should be undermined. Where should we be without it? Who would make good the lack of those great schools of sobriety and reverence, such as St. Sulpice, or that devoted service of the Daughters of Charity? How can we view without alarm the poverty of heart and the meanness of motive which even now invade the world? Our dissent from those who uphold the dogmatic faith is, after all, a mere difference of opinion; at heart we are their allies. We have but one enemy, who is also theirs, — a vulgar materialism, and the baseness of him who serves himself alone.

Peace, then, in God's name! Let the various classes of men live side by side, not by belying their proper genius for the sake of mutual concessions that would belittle them, but by lending one another mutual support. Nothing on earth should reign to the exclusion of its opposite; no one power

[1] Compare Tennyson's —

> Leave thou thy sister, when she prays,
> Her early Heaven, her happy views;
> Nor thou with shadow'd hint confuse
> A life that leads melodious days.
> . . . . . .
> Hold thou the good: define it well,
> For fear Divine Philosophy
> Should push beyond her mark, and be
> Procuress to the Lords of Hell. — Ed.

should suppress the rest. The true harmony of mankind results from the free utterance of the most discordant notes. If orthodoxy should succeed in destroying science we know what would follow. Spain and the Moslem world are perishing from having effected that task too scrupulously. If Reason should insist on ruling the world without regard to the religious needs of the soul, we have the experience of the French Revolution to tell us what the consequence would be. The spirit of Art carried to the utmost refinement, without integrity of soul, made Italy of the Renaissance a land of cutthroats, an accursed soil. Barrenness of heart, folly, and mediocrity, are the nemesis which has overtaken some Protestant countries, where, under the pretension of good sense and a Christian spirit, Art has been suppressed and Science reduced to paltry technicality. Lucretius and Saint Theresa, Aristophanes and Socrates, Voltaire and Saint Francis, Raphael and Saint Vincent de Paul, have all a like claim to be. Humanity would be dwarfed if one of the elements which make it up should be lost to it.

THE APOSTLES.

CHAPTER I.

ACCOUNTS OF THE RESURRECTION OF JESUS. — A. D. 33.

ALTHOUGH Jesus had frequently spoken of the resurrection and the new life, he had never distinctly said that he should himself rise in bodily form from the grave.[1] At first the disciples had no such definite hope. The feelings which they naturally betray assume a belief that all is now over. They bury their beloved companion with grief and tears, — if not as an ordinary person, at least as one whose loss is irreparable.[2] They are sad and downcast. The hope they have cherished, that in him the deliverance of Israel would be brought about, is now shown to be vain. They may be spoken of as men who have lost a great and endeared illusion.

But enthusiasm and love admit no situation without relief. They mock at impossibility, and, rather than

[1] See Mark xvi. 11; Luke xviii. 34; xxiv. 11; John xx. 9, 24–29. The Synoptics admit that, if Jesus did speak of it, his disciples understood nothing of it: Mark ix. 11, 31; Luke xviii. 34 (compare Luke xxiv. 8; John ii. 21, 22. The contrary view — found in Math. xii. 40; xvi. 4, 21; xvii. 9, 23; xx. 19; xxvii. 32; Mark viii. 31; ix. 9, 10, 31; x. 34; Luke ix. 32; xi. 29, 30; xviii. 31–34; xxiv. 6–8; and Justin, *Tryph.* 106 — originated in a later conviction that he must have predicted the event.

[2] Mark xvi. 10; Luke xxiv. 17, 21.

despair, they repudiate the brute fact. Many words of the Master were recalled, chiefly those in which he spoke of his later coming; and these might be explained as a prediction of his rising from the tomb.[1] Such a belief, too, was so natural that the disciples' faith was enough to have created it outright. The great prophets Enoch and Elijah had never tasted death. A belief was coming to prevail that the patriarchs and the chief men under the ancient Law were not really dead; that their bodies were still living and breathing in their sepulchres at Hebron.[2] That must come to pass in the case of Jesus which has come to pass in the case of all who have drawn upon themselves the admiring gaze of their fellow-men. The world, which has ascribed to them super-human merit, cannot endure to believe that they have undergone the unjust, unequal, and revolting doom of ordinary death. At the moment that Mahomet expired, Omar rushed from the tent, sword in hand, and declared that he would smite off the head of any who should say that the Prophet was no more.[3] Death is a thing of such unreason, when it strikes a man of genius or of noble heart, that the popular mind does not conceive the possibility of such violation of the truth of nature. The hero does not die. Is not the true life that which still survives in the heart of those who have loved? For years this adored Master had filled the little world grouped about him with joy and hope. Would they

[1] Passages before cited, especially Luke xvii. 24, 25; xviii. 31–34.

[2] See Babyl. Talm. *Baba Bathra*, 58 *a*, and the passage quoted in Arabic by Abbé Bargès in the *Bulletin de l'œuvre des pèlerinages en terre sainte*, Feb. 1863.

[3] Ibn-Hisham, *Sirat errasoul*, ed. Wüstenfeld, 1012, 1013.

consent to let him moulder in the tomb? No, he had lived too long in those who followed him, for them not to affirm that after his death he still lived.[1]

The day succeeding the burial of Jesus — Saturday, the 15th of Nisan, — was filled with thoughts like these. All handiwork was forbidden by the Sabbath. But rest was never more fruitful. To the Christian heart there was but one object, the entombed person of the Master. The women, especially, lavished upon him in thought the tenderest attentions. They did not, for a moment, forget that gentle friend whom wicked men had slain, now reposing in his bed perfumed with myrrh — attended doubtless, by angels who hid their faces in his winding-sheet. He had said, indeed, that he should die, that his death would be the sinner's ransom, that he would live again in the kingdom of his Father. Yes, he will live again! God will not leave his soul in hell; He will not suffer His chosen One to see corruption.[2] What of the ponderous tombstone that rests above him? He will lift it off; he will rise and ascend to the right hand of his Father whence he came. We shall see him again. We shall hear his consoling voice. Again we shall have the joy of companionship with him, and vainly have men slain him.

Belief in the immortality of the soul, which under the influence of Greek philosophy has become a Christian dogma, allows us very easily to deprive death of its meaning, since the dissolution of the body is thus the deliverance of the soul, set free henceforth from the burden that weighed upon its true life. But this view,

[1] Luke xxiv. 23; Acts xxv. 19; Jos. *Antiq.* xviii. 3:3.

[2] Psalm xvi. 10. The sense of the Hebrew is slightly different, but we have given the usual translation.

making of man a compound of two substances, was not intelligible to the Jew. The kingdom of God, or the kingdom of the Spirit, was to the Jewish mind a complete transformation of the world and an annihilation of death.[1] To admit that Death could have the victory over Jesus, who had come to conquer Death, was the height of absurdity. His disciples had once revolted at the very idea that he could suffer.[2] They had now, therefore, no other choice than keen despair and an heroic resolve. A person of insight might have predicted on that Saturday that Jesus would live again. The little Christian company on that day wrought the true miracle, bringing Jesus back to life in its heart by its own intense affection for him, and resolving that he should not die. In these impassioned souls love was truly mightier than death.[3] And, as impassioned feeling is by its own nature contagious, kindling like a torch a flame of similar passion, and thus going on indefinitely, Jesus, in a sense, was already risen from the dead. Once let it appear that his body is no longer here, and faith in the Resurrection is established for perpetuity.

This last condition befell under circumstances which, though obscured by the incoherence of tradition and by contradictory accounts, may yet be reconstructed with sufficient probability by a careful study of the accounts in the four evangelists, compared with the celebrated passage of Paul in the fifteenth chapter of "First Corinthians" (verses 4–8).

Very early on Sunday morning, the Galilæan women,

[1] 1 Thess. iv. 13–18; 1 Cor. chap. xv.; Rev. chaps. xx.–xxii.
[2] Matt. xvi. 21–23; Mark viii. 31–33.
[3] Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 3:3.

who on Friday evening had hastily wrapped the body with spices and myrrh, returned to the cave where it had been temporarily left. These were Mary of Magdala, Mary, wife of Cleopas, Salome, Joanna, the wife of Chuza, and a few others.[1] They probably came singly; for, while we can hardly question the account in all the Synoptics that there were several at the tomb, — though John (xx. 2) seems to suppose that Mary was not quite alone, — it is sure, from the two most authentic narratives, those in John and Mark, that Mary of Magdala acted wholly by herself.[2] Whatever the circumstances, her share at this important moment was apart from the rest. Her we must follow step by step, for during one hour of this day she may be said to have borne the entire burden of the Christian conscience. Upon her testimony rested the faith of the future.

Call now to mind that the enclosure in which the body of Jesus had been laid was a cave newly hollowed in the rock, and situated in a garden near the place of execution,[3] — a circumstance which determined the choice, since it was late, and it was sought to avoid the violation of the Sabbath.[4] The first evangelist adds that the garden and tomb belonged to Joseph of Ari-

[1] Matt. xxviii. 1; Mark xvi. 1; Luke xxiv. 1; John xx. 1.

[2] John xx. 1, 2, 11–18; Mark xvi. 9. Note that the closing chapter of Mark, as we have it, is in two distinct portions: xvi. 1–8 and 9–20; besides two other passages preserved in the Paris MS. L, and the margin of the Philoxenian version [Syriac, of date 508]: see N. T. ed. of Griesbach-Schultz, i. 291; and by Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.* ii. The later ending (vv. 9–20) is wanting in MS. B (Vatican), in the Sinaitic, and in the more important Greek MSS. It is, however, at all events very old, and its agreement with the Fourth Gospel is striking.

[3] Matt. xxvii. 60; Mark xv. 46; Luke xxiii. 53.

[4] John xix. 41, 42.

mathæa. But, in general, the additions made by this writer to the common tradition are of little value, especially as regarding the account of the later period.[1] The same gospel mentions another detail, which in the silence of the other accounts is improbable, — namely, the sealing of the sepulchre and the setting of a guard.[2] Call to mind, besides, that the caverns for burial were low cells, cut in a sloping rock, an upright surface having first been trimmed off. The doorway, usually close to the bottom, was closed by a very heavy stone, fitted to a groove.[3] These cells had no lock closed by a key, the weight of the stone being the only protection against robbers or violators of the tomb; so that some tool, or the combined effort of several persons, was needed to remove it. All the accounts agree in saying that the stone was set to the entrance on Friday evening.

Now when Mary Magdalen arrived on Sunday morning, the stone was not in place. The body was no longer there. The idea of a resurrection had as yet been hardly thought of. Her mind was full of a tender sorrow and the desire to pay the last burial service to the body of her beloved Master; and her first feeling was that of surprise and pain. Her last hope was gone with the disappearance of the body, which her hand should never touch again. And whither had it gone? Rejecting the thought of a violated sepulchre, she felt, it may be, an instant's gleam of hope; and

[1] See "Life of Jesus," Introd. p. 39.

[2] The gospel of the Hebrews may perhaps have contained a similar circumstance: Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 2.

[3] Vogüé, *Les églises de la terre sainte*, 125, 126. The verb "roll away" (Matt. xxviii. 2; Mark xvi. 3, 4; Luke xxiv. 2) shows that this was the arrangement with the sepulchre of Jesus.

without a moment of delay, she ran to the house where Peter and John were met,[1] crying, "They have taken away the Master's body, and we do not know where they have laid him."

The two disciples rise in haste and run at speed toward the spot. John, the younger, arriving first, stoops and looks within. Mary was right; the tomb was empty, and the pieces of cloth which had served for the burial were scattered about in the cave. As Peter comes up, the two go in together and look at the pieces of cloth, — no doubt blood-stained, — remarking in particular the napkin that had been wrapped about the head, in a corner by itself.[2] They then return to their lodgings in extreme perplexity. If they did not actually speak the decisive words, "He is risen!" we may yet say that the inference was irresistible, and that the belief which was the living germ of Christianity was already fixed.

After Peter and John had left the garden, Mary remained near the sepulchre, weeping, her mind filled with the one thought, "Where had the body been laid?" and her woman's heart simply yearning to

[1] In all this account, the Fourth Gospel is greatly superior to the others, and is our chief guide. The passage of Mark (xvi. 7), in MS. L and the Philoxenian version, reads, "to those with Peter." Paul also (1 Cor. xv. 5) speaks only of Peter in this first appearing. Further on, Luke (xxiv. 24) speaks of others who went to the tomb, referring, probably, to successive visits. John may possibly have been influenced by the motive (which appears elsewhere in his Gospel) of showing that he, as well as Peter, had a leading part in the evangelic history. Perhaps, too, his repeated assertion that he was an eye-witness of the essential facts of the Christian faith (John i. 14; xxi. 24; 1 John i. 1–3; iv. 14) may refer to this visit.

[2] John xx. 1–10; comp. Luke xxiv. 12, 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5; and the passage in Mark.

clasp again the beloved form. Suddenly, hearing a slight sound, she turns about and sees a man standing, whom she supposes to be the gardener: "Oh," she cries, "if you have taken him, tell me where you have laid him that I may carry him away." As the only reply, she hears her own name spoken — "Mary!" — in the very voice, the very tone, so familiar in her memory, and cries, "Oh, my Master!" pressing forward as if to touch him, or with an instinctive gesture to kiss his feet.[1] The vision lightly recedes, and, with the words, "Touch me not," gradually disappears.[2] But the miracle of love is already wrought. Mary has done what Peter could not do; she has found a living form, a sweet and penetrating voice, by the very border of the tomb. It is no longer a matter of inference or of conjecture: Mary has seen and heard. The Resurrection has now its first immediate witness.

Wild with love and joy, she now returns to the city, saying to the first of the disciples whom she met, "I have seen him; he has spoken to me." (John xx. 18.) Greatly disturbed in her fancy, with broken and wandering speech,[3] she was taken by some of them to be insane; while Peter and John relate what they have seen, and other disciples go to the tomb and see for themselves.[4] The fixed conviction of all this first group was that Jesus was indeed risen from the dead. Many doubts still remained; but the strong assurance of Mary, Peter, and John became that of the rest. It

[1] See Matt. xxviii. 9, 10; comparing John xx. 16, 17.

[2] John xx. 11–17; Mark xvi. 9, 10; compare the parallel but less satisfactory accounts in Matt. xxviii. 1–10; Luke xxiv. 1–10.

[3] Compare Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 2.

[4] Luke xxiv. 11, 24.

was later called "Peter's vision."[1] Paul, especially, says nothing of what Mary had seen, alleging that the first appearance had been to Peter. But this is inaccurate, since Peter saw only the empty tomb and the gravecloths; while in Mary alone love was strong enough to go beyond nature, and behold the living form of the divine Master. In such a critical event it is nothing to see after others have already seen. The first witness determines all; the vision vouchsafed to others is modelled upon a type already existent. The finer organization has the gift to conceive the image on the instant, with the precision of a draughtsman's design. The glory of the Resurrection is accordingly due to Mary Magdalen. Next after Jesus, hers was the most essential part in the founding of Christianity. The image created by her vivid susceptibility still hovers before the world. She, as chief and princess among visionaries, has better than any other made the vision of her impassioned soul a real thing to the world's conviction. That grand cry from her woman's heart, "He is risen!" has become the mainspring of faith to mankind. Hence, feeble Reason! Test not by cold analysis this masterpiece of ideality and love! If wisdom despairs of consolation to the unhappy race of man, abandoned by destiny, let unreason attempt the venture! Where is the wise man who has bestowed upon the world so exalted joy as this visionary Mary Magdalen?

Meanwhile the other women who had been at the

[1] Luke xxiv. 34; 1 Cor. xv. 5; Mark xvi. 7 (MS. L). The fragment of the gospel of the Hebrews (Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* 3; Jerome, *De viris illustr.* 16) seems to have put Peter's vision in the evening, confusing it with that of the assembled apostles; but Paul expressly distinguishes the two incidents.

sepulchre carried abroad their various reports.[1] They had not seen Jesus,[2] but they spoke of a man clothed in white whom they had perceived in the cave, who had said to them, "He is no longer here; go back to Galilee: he will go before you, and you will see him there."[3] Their hallucination may have arisen from the view of the white gravecloths; or they may really have seen nothing, and told of their vision only after Mary Magdalen had related hers. According to one of the more authentic texts (Mark xvi. 8) they were for some time speechless, their silence being ascribed to terror. However this may be, these tales continued to grow larger every hour, and came to be strangely disfigured. The man in white became an angel of the Lord; it was said that his garment was dazzling like snow, and his face like lightning. Others spoke of two angels, one at the head, the other at the foot, of the place where the body had lain.[4] By evening, many persons no doubt already believed that the women had seen this angel come down from the sky and roll back the stone, while Jesus burst forth with a noise.[5] No doubt their

[1] Luke xxiv. 22–24, 34, from which passages we infer that the rumours were carried separately.

[2] Mark xvi. 1–8. Matthew (xxviii. 9, 10) says otherwise; but this is out of keeping with the general view of the Synoptics, which holds that the woman saw only an angel. The first evangelist seems desirous to reconcile this with the fourth, who says that one woman alone beheld the vision of Jesus.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 2–7; Mark xvi. 5–7; Luke xxiv. 4–7, 23. The apparition of angels is also found in the account of the Fourth Gospel (xx. 12, 13), which misplaces it, applying it to Mary Magdalen, through unwillingness to sacrifice this feature of the tradition.

[4] Luke xxiv. 4–7; John xx. 12, 13.

[5] Matt. xxviii. 1–7. In the account of Matthew the circumstances are most exaggerated. The earthquake and the part taken by the guard are probably late additions.

own testimony varied.[1] Each being under the influence of the imagination of the others, as is always the case with simple folk, they accepted all the embellishments, and took each her part in creating the legend which grew up about them from their words.

The day was disturbed and eventful. The little company was widely scattered. Some were already set off for Galilee; others had hidden themselves in alarm.[2] The melancholy scene of Friday, the harrowing sight they had had before their eyes, beholding one from whom they had hoped so much hanging on the cross while his Father came not to deliver him, had further shaken the faith of many. In some directions the stories told by Peter and the women found only a hardly disguised incredulity.[3] The several accounts crossed with one another; the women went here and there with strange and incoherent tales, each outbidding the others. The most contrary opinions prevailed. Some still bewailed the so recent tragic event; others already triumphed; all were inclined to accept the most extraordinary tales. Meanwhile the distrust moved by the exalted condition of Mary Magdalen,[4] the slight credence given to the testimony of the women, and the incoherence of their accounts, caused great doubt. They were under expectation of fresh visions which must needs come. Their state of mind was thus wholly favourable to the

[1] The six or seven accounts which we have of the events of the morning — two or three in Mark, an independent one from Paul, besides that in the gospel of the Hebrews — are very discordant with one another.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 31; Mark xiv. 27; John xvi. 32; Justin, *Apol.* i. 50; *Tryph.* 53, 106. Justin implies that at the death of Jesus some of the disciples were out-and-out deserters.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 17; Mark xvi. 11; Luke xxiv. 11.

[4] Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 2.

spread of strange rumours. If all the little church had been assembled, the growth of legend would have been impossible: those who knew the secret of the disappearance of the body would probably have protested against the error. But in the general confusion the door was open to the most rapid spread of ill-understood reports.

For those conditions of mind which give rise to ecstasy and visions are in their nature highly contagious.[1] Visions of this sort are quickly caught up and repeated, as the history of every great religious movement shows. In a gathering of persons sharing the same beliefs, it is enough for one of them to speak of supernatural visions or voices, when others of the same circle are sure to see and hear the same thing. Among the persecuted Protestants a rumour would spread that angels had been heard singing psalms on the ruins of some chapel just destroyed; and at once crowds would go and hear the same psalm.[2] In cases of this kind, the most heated fancy is that which gives the rule of credence and sets the standard of the common temperature. The rapture of a few spreads among the

[1] See for example, Calmeil, *De la folie au point de vue pathologique*, etc., Paris, 1845, 2 vols.

[2] See Jussieu, *Lettres pastorales*, letters 7 (1st year) and 4 (3d year); Misson, *Le Théâtre sacré des Cévennes*: London, 1707, 28, 34, 38, 102, 103, 104, 107; Memoirs of Court, in Sayous, *Hist. de la littér. française à l'étranger*, xvii. cent. i. 303; *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme Français*, 1862, 174.

Stories of similar apparitions are familiar in the reports of the Society for Psychical Research. Upwards of seven hundred cases were submitted to a single expert. ("The Will to Believe," etc., by Prof. William James, p. 311.) I have myself conversed with an intelligent and hard-headed judge of sixty, in a western State, who told me with much precision of apparitions of his deceased wife, with whom, it was further said, he had sometimes divided and partaken food. — Ed.

rest; no one wishes to be backward, or to confess that he is less favoured than the others. Those who see nothing are drawn on, and believe at length either that they are less clear-sighted, or took less note of what they saw. At all events they will not make it known, for this would disturb the good feeling, grieve the company, and be an unpleasant part to play. When an apparition is announced in such a gathering, all will generally see it, or at least assent to it. We should remember, too, what was the standard of mental culture among the companions of Jesus. The most admirable goodness of soul often goes along with a weak faculty of judgment. The disciples believed in apparitions;[1] they fancied themselves to be in the midst of miracles; they had no share whatever in the scientific spirit of their time. Science, indeed, existed only among some hundreds of men, here and there, in the countries penetrated by Greek culture. The common people, everywhere, had little or no share in it. Palestine was in this regard a very backward country; the Galilæans were the most ignorant of Palestinians; and the disciples of Jesus might count among the simplest of the Galilæans. This very simplicity of theirs had won to them their heavenly calling. In such a community were the most favourable conditions possible for the spread of belief in marvels. When an opinion that Jesus was risen once spread abroad, numerous visions could not fail to follow, as in fact they did.

Late in the forenoon of this very Sunday, when the reports of the women had had time to circulate, two disciples, one of them named Cleopas (or Cleopatros), went upon a short excursion to a village called Emmaus,

[1] Matt. xiv. 26; Mark vi. 49; Luke xxiv. 37; John iv. 19.

not far from Jerusalem.[1] They were talking together of the events that had just happened, and were full of sadness. On the way, a stranger joined their company, and asked the occasion of their grief. "Are you," said they, "the only stranger in Jerusalem, not to know what has happened there? Have you not heard of the prophet Jesus of Nazareth, a man powerful in deed and word before God and the people? Do you not know how the priests and rulers caused him to be condemned and crucified? We hoped that it was he who should deliver Israel; and it is now the third day since all this took place. And then, some women of our company threw us into strange perplexity this very morning. Before daylight they were at the tomb; they did not find the body, but reported that they had seen angels, who told them that he is still alive. Some of our number went afterwards to the tomb, where they found all as the women had said; but him they did not see." The stranger was a pious man, versed in the Scripture, who quoted from Moses and the prophets. The three soon found themselves good friends. When they came to Emmaus, as the stranger seemed about to continue his journey, the others begged him to remain and share the evening meal with them. Daylight was declining, and their sorrowful recollections grew more bitter. This hour of the evening repast was that which more

[1] Mark xvi. 12, 13; Luke xxiv. 13–33; but compare Jos. *War*, vii. 6: 6. Luke puts it at sixty furlongs from Jerusalem, Josephus at thirty (sixty, found in some MSS, is a Christian alteration: see Dindorf's ed.). The most probable situation is *Kulonié*, a pretty place at the entrance to a valley, on the way to Jerusalem. See note on p. 344 of "Antichrist"; also Sepp, *Jerus. und das heilige Land* (1863), i. 56; Bourquenoud, *Études rel. hist. et litt.* in PP. of the Society of Jesus, 1863, no. 9; for the exact distance, H. Zschokke, *Das neutest. Emmaüs* (Shaffhausen, 1865).

than any other brought back the charm of sad and tender memories. How often, at this very hour, had they seen the beloved Master, laying aside the burden of the day in the cheer of friendly conversation enlivened by a sip of the delicious native wine, and speaking to them of that "fruit of the vine" which he would drink with them anew in his Father's kingdom. The gesture with which he broke and distributed the bread, as the head of the household among the Jews, was deeply graven on their memory. Forgetting in their pensive sadness the presence of a stranger, they seemed to see Jesus himself in the act of holding, breaking, and offering the bread; and they hardly perceived that their companion, in haste to proceed on his way, had already left them. When wakened from their reverie, "Did not we feel," said one to the other, "that there was something strange? Do you remember how our hearts burned within us by the way while he was speaking with us?" "And the prophecies which he repeated," returned the other, "surely proved that the Messiah must suffer before he could enter into his glory. Did you not know him when he broke the bread?" "Yes, our eyes were blinded till then, but were opened when he went away." The conviction of the two disciples was that they had really seen Jesus, and they hastily returned to Jerusalem.

At this very time the main body of the disciples were met with Peter.[1] Night was now fully come. Each spoke of his own impression, and of the reports which he had heard. The general belief was that Jesus was risen from the dead. When the two disciples came in,

[1] Mark xvi. 14; Luke xxiv. 33–35; John xx. 19, 20; Gospel of the Hebrews, in Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.* 3; Jer. *De viris ill.*, 16; 1 Cor. xv. 5; Justin, *Tryph.* 106.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

they were told at once of what was already called "Peter's vision" (Luke xxiv. 34). They, on their part, told what had befallen them on the road, and how Jesus had been known to them in the breaking of bread. The imagination of all was greatly stirred. The doors were shut for fear of the Jews. Eastern cities are still after sunset. There was at times deep silence within doors; any slight chance sound was sure to be understood in the sense of the common expectation. Such expectation will often create its object.[1] In some hush of stillness, a light breath of air passed over the faces of those present. In these critical moments a current of air, the creak of a casement, a chance murmur, may fix the belief of a people for centuries. As the breath of air was felt, sounds were heard, or fancied. Some said that they had distinguished the word *Shalom*, that is, "blessing" or "peace." This was the usual salutation of Jesus, the word by which he announced his presence. No doubt could be felt: he was surely present in the gathering. This was that dear voice, to be recognized by all.[2] This fancy was all the easier to accept, since

[1] On an island over against Rotterdam, where the population consists of the austerest Calvinists, the peasants are persuaded that Jesus comes to their death-bed to assure his elect of their salvation. Many, in fact, behold him thus.

[2] To conceive the possibility of such illusions, we need only call to mind scenes in our own day, where a company of persons insist, with perfect good faith, that they have heard sounds that had no reality. The listening mood, the act of imagination, the disposition to believe, sometimes the yielding to others' impressions, may explain such of these illusions as are not the direct effect of fraud. Persons of strong conviction, of kindly feeling, reluctant to break the harmony or to embarrass the masters of the house, are responsible for most of such compliances. When one believes in miracle, one often helps it out unconsciously. Doubt and denial are impossible in such companies: they would be an affront to the hospitable entertainer. Thus experiments which succeed in a select

Jesus himself had said that whenever his disciples were gathered in his name he would be in the midst of them. It was, then, an accepted belief that on the Sunday evening he had appeared before his gathered disciples. Some even thought they discerned in his hands and feet the print of nails, and on his side the scar of a spear-wound. A widely extended tradition held that on this very evening he breathed upon his disciples the Holy Spirit.[1] It was commonly received that his breath had passed over the assembly.

Such were the incidents of this day, decisive for the future of humanity. The belief that Jesus was risen was irrevocably fixed. The little group, thought to have been blotted out by the death of its leader, was now secure of a mighty future.

A few doubts, however, still remained.[2] The apostle Thomas, who had not been present at the Sunday evening gathering, confessed a shade of jealousy toward those who had seen the print of nails and the scar from the spear. It is said that one week later he was satisfied;[3] but there still rested on him a slight stain, and a shadow of mild reproach. With a fine instinctive sense, it was felt that the ideal may not be touched with hands, or subjected to experimental tests. "Touch me not" is the watchword of a great affection. The touch leaves nothing to faith. The eye is a purer a nobler organ than the hand: the eye itself unsullied, which sullies nothing, would soon come to be a needless

group commonly fail before an audience that pays for admission, and always fail before a scientific committee.

[1] John xx. 22, 23; repeated in Luke xxiv. 49.

[2] Matt. xxviii. 17; Mark xvi. 14; Luke xxiv. 39, 40.

[3] John xx. 24–29; comp. Mark xvi. 14; Luke xxiv. 39, 40; and the passage of Mark preserved by Jerome, *Adv. Pelagium*, ii.

witness. A curious scruple here begins to betray itself. Any hesitation seems a lack of loyalty and love. One reproaches himself for being behind the rest; he forbids himself even the wish to see. "Happy are they who have not seen and yet have believed" (John xx. 29) becomes the motto of the situation. It is found that there is something more generous in believing without proof. True friends at heart claim not to have had direct vision: thus we note that John, the assumed relator of the above incident, has no special vision of his own;[1] thus, in a later age, Saint Louis refuses to be witness of an eucharistic miracle, lest he deprive himself of the merit of faith. From this time forth, in the matter of credulity, we find an amazing emulation, each bidding against the rest. Since merit consisted in belief without sight, faith at all costs — gratuitous or blind faith, faith running into madness — was exalted as the first of spiritual gifts. The ground is already laid for the confession, "I believe because it is absurd;" and the law of Christian dogma becomes a strange process of advance, which will pause at no impossibility. A sort of chivalrous sentiment forbids the ever looking back. Beliefs dearest to piety, those clung to with the utmost frenzy, are precisely those most repugnant to reason; and this because of the appealing notion that the moral value of faith increases in proportion to the difficulty of belief, and that to admit what is evident to the mind is no proof of love in the heart.

These first days were thus, as it were, a period of burning fever. The faithful, yielding to the common

[1] Compare 1 Cor. xv. 5–8.

intoxication, and imposing each his own dreams upon the rest, vied with one another, and pushed one another on to moods of the highest exaltation. Visions were multiplied without limit. Evening assemblies were the commonest occasions for their occurrence.[1] When the doors were shut, when all were possessed by their fixed idea, the first who thought he heard, softly spoken, the word *Shalom*, "blessing" or "peace," would give the signal. All listened, and presently all heard the same sound. Then it was a great joy to these confiding souls to know that their Master was in the midst of them. Each tasted the sweetness of this thought, and believed himself favoured with a private interview. Other visions took form upon another pattern, resembling those of the wayfarers toward Emmaus. At the hour of repast, they would see Jesus appear, take the bread, bless it, break it, and offer it to the one favoured to behold him.[2] Within a few days a complete cycle of accounts, differing widely in detail but inspired by the same spirit of devoted love and faith, took form and currency. It is a most serious error to suppose that legend needs much time for its development. It may even spring forth, full-grown, in a single day. On Sunday evening, — the fifteenth of Nisam, the fifth of April, — the resurrection of Jesus was held as an established fact. One week later, the character of the life beyond the grave, in which he was conceived to have his being, was defined in all its essential features.

[1] John xx. 26. The passage xxi. 14 assumes, indeed, that there were at Jerusalem only two apparitions before the assembled disciples. But the passages xx. 30 and xxi. 25 allow more latitude of opinion. Comp. Acts i. 3.

[2] Luke xxiv. 41–43; Gospel of the Hebrews (Jer. *De vir. ill.* 2); closing passage of Mark, in Jer. *Adv. Pel.* 2.

CHAPTER II.

THE RETREAT IN GALILEE. — A. D. 33.

The livelist desire of those who have lost a dear friend is to revisit the spots made sacred by his memory. It was this motive, doubtless, that led the disciples to return to Galilee a few days after the events now narrated. It is probable that many had taken their way toward the northern districts as soon as Jesus was arrested, or immediately upon his death. Along with the announcement of his resurrection had come a rumour that he would be seen again in Galilee. Some of the women who had been at the sepulchre reported that the angel had given them tidings that Jesus had gone thither before them; others said that he had himself bidden them to follow him.[1] At times they seemed to recall that he had said the same during his lifetime.[2] However this may be, within a few days, perhaps after the Passover season was finished, the disciples fully believed they had a command to return to their native region, and did in fact go thither.[3] It may be that the visions at Jerusalem became less frequent.

[1] Matt. xxviii. 7, 10; Mark xvi. 7.

[2] Matt. xxvi. 32; Mark xiv. 28.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 16; John xxi.; Luke xxiv. 49, 50, 52; Acts 1. 3, 4. Luke's account here plainly contradicts Mark (xvi. 1–8) and Matthew. The later verses of Mark (9–20), with those before cited, not in the common text, seem to be fitted to Luke's account. But this has no weight against the general agreement with the Fourth Gospel, and with Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5–8) on the point.

The disciples were urged by a longing for their old home. Those short-lived apparitions were not enough to fill the great void caused by his absence. They sadly bethought them of that broad lake and those sunny hills where they had tasted the joy of the divine kingdom. The women, especially, longed to return to the scene of those pure delights, and we may note that the signal for departure came from them.[1] The hated city oppressed their spirit, they were eager to see once more the land where the loved Master had been their own, and were sure in advance that they should meet him there.

Most of the disciples, accordingly, went back filled with joy and hope, accompanying, perhaps, the caravan of returning pilgrims of the Passover. Their hope was not simply to find in Galilee a renewal of those passing visions, but Jesus himself, abiding with them as of old. This great persuasion filled all their thoughts. Would he restore the sovereignty of Israel, found once for all the kingdom of God, and (as the saying was) "reveal his justice"?[2] Anything was possible. In fancy they already saw again those smiling landscapes where they had dwelt with him. He had appointed a meeting with them — as many thought[3] — upon a mountain, the same, no doubt, to which their tenderest memories clung. Never was there a more joyous journey. All their dreams of bliss were now to be fulfilled: they should behold their Lord once more!

And in fact they did behold him. Their visions of peace had scarce come back to them, when they felt

[1] Matt. xxviii. 7, 16; Mark xvi. 7.

[2] See the verses of Mark (just alluded to) in Jerome, *Adv. Pel.* 2

[3] Matt. xxviii. 16.

themselves in the full tide of evangelic life. It was near the end of April, when the earth is strewn with the crimson blooms of the anemone, — probably those "lilies of the field," whose array Jesus had set above the glory of Solomon. At every step they would recall his words, associated as they were with the incidents of the way: "See! this is the tree, the flower, the sowing of seed, from which he took his parable; the hillside where his most moving discourse was spoken; the fishing-boat from which he taught." It was like a fair dream begun again, a vision that had vanished, now come back. The enchantment had taken new life. That sweet Galilæan "kingdom of God" resumed its course. This bright air, these mornings by the lakeside or on the hills, these nights spent on the wave in watching their nets, were once more filled with visions of glory. Again they saw him wherever they had once lived with him. Doubtless it was not always an untroubled joy. At times the lake must seem to them very lonely. But a great love is content with little. If, even as we are, we could once a year, at odd moments, see the loved ones whom we have lost long enough to exchange a few words of greeting, death would be no longer death!

Such was the condition of thought in that faithful company, during this short interval while the new faith returned to its birthplace, as it were, to bid it a last farewell. The leaders — Peter, Thomas, Nathanael, and the sons of Zebedee, James and John — met again at the lakeside, and lived together for a time their old life of fishermen, at Bethsaida or Capernaum, the Galilæan women, we may suppose, among them. These had been more urgent than any in pressing the return to

Galilee, — the craving of their hearts, — and this was their last act in the founding of Christianity. From this time forth they appear no more upon the scene. Faithful to their love, they would not quit again the region where the great blessing of their life had been enjoyed.[1] They were soon forgotten; and as Galilæan Christianity has left no history, their memory was quite lost in some lines of tradition. Those piteous demoniacs and converted sinners, — those women among the real founders of Christianity, Mary Magdalen, Mary, wife of Cleopas, Joanna, and Susanna, — have shared the destiny of neglected saints. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5–7) knows not of them. The very faith they had created seems to have remanded them to the shadow. We must come down to the Middle Age before the due claim is rendered them, when one of them at least, the Magdalene, takes her lofty rank in the Christian calendar of saints.

Visions appear to have been quite frequent on the lake shore. Why should not the disciples see their Lord again where they had once been, as it were, in direct touch with Deity? The commonest circumstance might bring him back. Once they had rowed all night and caught nothing; of a sudden their net was filled with fish; this was surely a miracle. Some one, they thought, had said, "Cast your net to the right." Peter and John looked at each other: "This is the Lord," says John. Peter, who was without his

[1] In Acts i. 14, the women, it is true, are found at Jerusalem at the time of the ascension; but this is in keeping with the general view of the writer (Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 1–4), who knows nothing of a return to Galilee after the resurrection, — a view opposed to that of Matthew and John. Hence he places the scene of the ascension at Bethany, contrary to all the other traditions.

garments, clad himself hastily, and threw himself into the water to meet the unseen prompteur.[1] At other times Jusus would come to partake of their simple meal. One day, as they came in from fishing, they were surprised to find a fire of coals ready kindled, with fish upon it and bread at hand. A quick memory of the pleasant repasts of old flashed upon their mind. Bread and fish were the essential aliment, which had often been offered them by Jesus. When the meal was over they were convinced that he had been seated at their side, and had handed them these viands, to them already eucharistic and sacred.[2]

Peter and John were especially favoured by these interviews with the holy apparition. Peter, one day — perhaps in a dream; but was not all their life by the lakeside a continual dream? — fancied he heard Jesus say to him, "Lovest thou me?" the question being thrice repeated. Filled as he was with a remorseful and tender emotion, his reply was, "Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee;" and each time the vision said, "Feed my sheep."[3] At another time Peter imparted to John a singular dream: he was walking with the

[1] John, chap. xxi. This passage seems to be a postscript to the finished Gospel, but from the same hand.

[2] John xxi. 9–44; comp. Luke xxiv. 41–43. John unites the two accounts in one, which may seem slightly artificial on looking at verses 14, 15. Hallucinations come singly, and not till later are grouped in connected stories. We find an example in the same writer of thus joining into one group incidents of months or weeks apart, by comparing Luke xxiv. 50–53 with Acts i. 3, 9. In the one, Jesus ascends to heaven on the day of the resurrection; in the other, after an interval of forty days. Taking Mark xvi. 9–20 strictly, he ascended on the evening following the resurrection. The example of Luke shows with how little care the accounts were pieced together.

[3] John xxi. 15–19.

Master, he said, John following a little behind, when Jesus spoke to him, very obscurely, of a doom of prison or violent death, each time adding, "Follow me;" upon which, Peter, pointing to John who followed, asked, "And what shall it be with him?" "If," Jesus answered, "I will that he remain till I come, what is that to thee? Follow me." After Peter's crucifixion John seems to have recalled this dream, finding in it a prediction of his friend's manner of death, and related it to his disciples, who accepted it as an assurance that their master would not die until Jesus should finally come.

These great melancholy dreams, these interviews continually broken and renewed with the risen Master, seem to have occupied days and months. Sympathy was freshly roused in Galilee for the prophet whom they of Jerusalem had put to death. More than five hundred persons were already gathered about the memory of Jesus (1 Cor. xv. 5). In the absence of their Master, they yielded to the authority of those who most nearly represented him, chiefly Peter. One day when the Galilæans of the brotherhood, following their leaders, had reached one of the heights to which Jesus had often led them, they believed that they saw him again. The air at these elevations, is often filled with strange glimmerings; and the same illusion which once — in the scene of the "transfiguration" — had caught the gaze of the nearer disciples, again took place. The gathered crowd thought they saw the godlike form traced in the sky; all fell upon their faces and worshipped.[1] The feeling impressed by these bright moun-

[1] Matt. xxviii. 16–20; 1 Cor. xv. 6; comp. Mark xvi. 15–20; Luke xxiv. 44–49.

tain landscapes is that of the vastness of the world, with the desire to overcome it. From one of the surrounding peaks, it was said, Satan had shown to Jesus "the kingdoms of the earth and the glory thereof," promising to give him all if he would worship him the Tempter. At this time, Jesus from these sacred heights pointed out the same splendours to his disciples, bidding them "go forth into all the world and proclaim the gospel to every creature." And they came down, fully persuaded that the Son of God had given them that command, and had promised to be with them till the end of time. Returning from these scenes, they were filled with a mysterious glow, a holy flame, regarding one another as envoys to the world, capable of working every wonder. Paul himself saw many of those present at this extraordinary scene; and, at the end of five and twenty years, the impression was still as living and strong as on the first day (1 Cor. xv. 6).

Almost a year passed away in this life suspended between heaven and earth.[1] Its charm, instead of

[1] John sets no limit to this later phase of the life of Jesus, appearing to suppose it of long continuance. According to Matthew, it seems to have been only enough for the journey to Galilee and the gathering at the appointed mountain. The unfinished account in Mark (xvi. 1–8) appears to take the same view with Matthew. Mark's second ending (xvi. 9–20) with that before cited from Jerome, and that of Luke, appear to limit this period to a single day. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5–8), in agreement with John, would extend it over a term of years, his own vision of Jesus, at the least, five or six years after these events, being spoken of as the last of the series. The same thing may be inferred from the words "five hundred brethren;" for the gathering of disciples directly after the death of Jesus (Acts i. 15) was by no means large enough to furnish forth such a number. Several Gnostic sects, especially the Valentinian and Sethian, reckoned the period of apparitions at eighteen months, even founding mystical theories upon this number (Iren. *Adv. hær.* i. 3 : 2 ; 30 : 14). Acts alone fixes the limit at forty days (i. 3); but this is weak authority,

weakening, grew ever stronger. What is really grand and holy continually gains in strength and purity. Our feeling towards the loved and lost is far more fruitful in its influence after the lapse of years than at first; and, the more remote from the event, so much the more constraining. The grief which at first mingled in and clouded the memory is changed into a pious serenity. The image of the departed is transfigured and idealised; it becomes a new soul in our life, a mainspring of action, a fountain of gladness, an oracle of wise counsel, a consolation for hours of gloom. There can be no apotheosis till after death. So beloved in life, Jesus was far dearer after his parting breath; or rather, this parting breath became the beginning of his true life in the heart of his Church. He thus came to be the intimate friend, the confidant, the companion by the way, who continues with us at every turning, is our fellow-guest at the board, and makes himself known — as at Emmaus — when he takes leave of us. The entire void of any scientific scruple in the mind of these new believers suffered no question to rise as to the nature of his being. He was figured to them as incapable of hurt, clad in aerial form, passing through closed doors, now seen, now unseen, but ever living. Sometimes his body was conceived as purely immaterial, a mere shadow or apparition (John xx. 19, 26); sometimes as fully ma-

especially as being part of an erroneous view (Luke xxiv. 49, 50, 52; Acts i. 4, 12) making this entire period to be passed at Jerusalem. The number "forty" is symbolic — as shown by the 40 years' wandering, the 40 days of Moses in the Mount, the 40 days' fast of Elijah and of Jesus, etc. As to the form of narrative in Mark xvi. 9–20, and in Luke, showing the limit of a single day, see the previous note (p. 64). The authority of Paul, the earliest and best of all, seems decisively to confirm that of the fourth evangelist.

terial with flesh and bones (Luke xxiv. 39), and was bidden by a childlike scruple (as if hallucination itself should guard against self-deception) to partake of food and drink, or allow itself to be felt and handled.[1] All thoughts concerning it were vague and shifting to the last degree.

Thus far I have hardly thought of a question idle in itself and impossible to answer. During all this scene of the true resurrection of Jesus, — that is, in the heart of those who loved him, while their conviction remained unshaken and the faith of after ages was matured, — where did the body lie mouldering in decay which on the Friday night had been laid in the sepulchre? This will forever remain unknown, for Christian tradition, naturally, has nothing to say upon the subject. "The flesh profiteth nothing; it is the spirit that giveth life" (John vi. 64). The resurrection was the triumph of idea over fact. Once the idea has become immortal, of what account is the bodily form that held it?

About the year 80 or 85, when the present text of the first evangelist received its last additions,[2] the Jews already had a fixed opinion upon this matter.[3] According to their account, the disciples had come at night and stolen away the body. The Christian conscience took alarm at this report, and, to cut it short, invented the circumstance of the armed guards and the sealed sepulchre.[4] As this account is found only in the First Gospel, where it follows incidents of little credibility

[1] Matt. xxviii. 9; Luke xxiv. 36–43; John xx. 27–29; xxi. 4–8; Gospel of Hebrews: Ignat. *Smyrn.*, 3; Jer. *De vir. ill.* 16.

[2] See the fifth volume of this series, "The Gospels."

[3] Matt. xxviii. 11–15; Justin, *Tryph.* 17, 108.

[4] Matt. xxvii. 62–66; xxviii. 4, 11–15.

(ver. 2–7), it is by no means to be admitted. But the Jewish explanation, though it cannot be disproved, does not cover the whole case. It is hardly to be supposed that those who so firmly believed the resurrection were the same that stole the body. Feeble as their faculty of reflection may have been, so strange an illusion is scarcely credible of them. The little church, we must remember, was at this time widely scattered. There was no common understanding, no recognised centre, no regular way of communication. Beliefs sprang up independently, and gathered into system as they could. Such contradictions as we find regarding the incidents of the Sunday morning show that rumours spread by divers channels, with no thought of consistency. Very possibly, the body may have been taken away by some of the disciples and conveyed to Galilee,[1] while the others, remaining behind at Jerusalem, knew nothing of it, — those who had borne the body to Galilee being equally ignorant of what was going on meanwhile at Jerusalem, so that the news of a belief in the resurrection came to them afterwards as a surprise. They would then have put in no protest; or, if they had, it would have made no difference. In a question of miracle, after correction is of no account, as we see with the miracles of Salette and Lourdes.[2] Difficulty of fact

[1] See a vague hint to this effect in Matt. xxvi. 32; xxviii. 7, 10; Mark xiv. 28; xvi. 7.

[2] One of the commonest ways of the growth of miraculous tales is this. A holy person is reputed to be a healer of disease. A sick person is brought, and is relieved by some sudden flow of emotional excitement; and within a day the story of a miracle will have spread through a circle of twenty or thirty miles. A few days later, the patient dies, but no one talks of it, and on the very hour of his burial the tale of his miraculous cure may be fervently repeated a hundred miles away. Diogenes Laërtius (vi. 2: 59) tells the whole story of such delusions.

LAERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

does not prevent the contagion of feeling, which creates its own legend to meet the demand.[1] In the late story of the miracle at Salette, error or fraud was absolutely proved before the civil tribunal and the court at Grenoble (May 2, 1855, May 6, 1857); but this did not prevent a church from being built, or crowds from thronging to it.

We may assume, then, that the disappearance of the body was the act of Jews. They may have thought thus to prevent scenes of tumult which might arise over the body of one so popular, or put a stop to noisy funeral obsequies, or the erection of a pompous tomb. Or, again, may not the body have been removed by the owner of the ground, or by the gardener?[2] The owner was (as I have before hinted), probably a stranger to the sect, this spot having been chosen, in haste, because it was the nearest[3] — to his displeasure, so that he took steps at once to remove the body. It is true that the details as to the shroud and the napkin, carefully folded and put aside (John xx. 6, 7), hardly agree with this view: the latter circumstance, indeed, would rather make us think of a woman's hand, perhaps Mary of Bethany, who has no part assigned in the events of the Sunday morning.[4] The five accounts of the visits of

[1] A very striking example is found every year at Jerusalem. The orthodox Greeks claim that the fire self-kindled at the holy sepulchre on Good Friday wipes off the sins of those who expose their faces to it without scorching them. Thousands of pilgrims make trial of it, and no doubt feel it keenly (their writhings and the smell of singed flesh are enough to prove it); but no one ever denies the orthodox belief. This would be a proof that one was weak in faith, or (good heavens!) to confess that the Latin is the true Church; for by the Greeks the miracle is held to be the strongest proof that theirs is the only true Church.

[2] Of which we seem to find a hint in John xx. 15.

[3] So stated in John xix. 41, 42.

[4] See "Life of Jesus," pp. 332, 344.

the women are so confused and uncertain that we may well suspect some obscure misapprehension. An emotional nature under strong excitement is subject to the most singular delusions, and becomes an accomplice of its own dreams.[1] No one thinks deliberately of bringing about the incidents regarded as miraculous, but everybody is brought involuntarily to connive at them. Mary Magdalene had, in the language of the time, been "possessed by seven demons."[2] Throughout the story we have to bear in mind the extreme mental levity of Eastern women, their total lack of education, and the peculiar quality of their sincerest conviction, which, when raised to a certain pitch, takes them quite out of themselves. When one sees heaven everywhere, one is easily brought to put one's self at times in the place of heaven.

Let us draw a veil over these mysteries of the human heart. In a condition of religious crisis, when everything is regarded as divine, the pettiest cause may bring about the grandest result. If we were witnesses of the strange facts that lie near the origin of all acts of faith, we should see in them incidents that would look wholly out of keeping with the gravity of the events they bring about, while some of them would only make us smile. Our old cathedrals are among the noblest structures in all the world. We cannot enter them without being conscious of a certain intoxication of infinitude. Now these glorious wonders of mediæval faith are almost always the flowering-out of some petty deception. What matter the special motive that lay behind it? The result, in such a matter, is all that

[1] See remarks in Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 55.

[2] Mark xvi. 9; Luke viii. 3.

counts. To pure faith all things are pure. The true cause of the resurrection was not this or that outward incident which may have instigated a belief in it. The real power which brought Jesus back from the dead was the power of human love. This was of itself so mighty, that a little chance incident was enough to build the great structure of universal faith. If he had been less beloved, if there had thus been a weaker motive for the faith, all those chance incidents would have been to no effect: nothing whatever would have come of them. A grain of sand may serve to overthrow a mountain when the moment of its fall is come. The greatest events may flow at once from the mightiest sources and from the feeblest. The mighty source is alone the real one; the feeble may at best decide the where and the when of a result which has already long been predetermined.

CHAPTER III.

THE RETURN TO JERUSALEM. — A. D. 34.

MEANWHILE the visions became less frequent and less bright. It must always be so in movements of enthusiastic faith. The popular imagination is like a contagious malady. Its virulence quickly abates, and it takes another form. The activity of these burning souls was already turning towards another object. What they seemed to hear from the lips of their dear risen Lord was the command to go before him, to preach, to convert the world. Whither should they go? Naturally, to Jerusalem (Luke xxiv. 47). Their return thither was then resolved upon by those who at this moment gave direction to the body. As these journeys were commonly undertaken in company, by caravans, at festal periods, we may assume that the return to Jerusalem took place at the feast of Tabernacles, at the end of A. D. 33, or at the Passover season of A. D. 34.

Galilee was thus left behind by the Christian movement, and left behind forever. The little church remaining there was doubtless still alive, but we hear no more of it. It was probably crushed out, like all else, by the implacable havoc which that region underwent in the war under Vespasian; and fragments of the dispersed community took refuge beyond the Jordan. After the war, not Christianity but Judaism returned to Galilee. In the second, third, and fourth centuries,

Galilee is a country thoroughly Jewish, the centre of Judaism, the home of the Talmud.[1] It was thus but for an hour that Galilee had its part in Christian history; but that was emphatically the sacred hour, which gave to the new religion its ever-enduring quality, its poesy and charm. The gospel, as we find it in the Synoptics, was the work of Galilee. And, as I shall try to show hereafter, the gospel, so understood, has been the main cause of the triumphs of Christianity, and remains the surest pledge of its future.

It is likely that a portion of the little company that gathered about Jesus in the last days of his life had stayed behind in Jerusalem. When the parting took place, belief in the resurrection was already settled; and this belief naturally developed in two directions, with noticeably different features, thus giving rise to the wide divergence which we find in the accounts. A Galilæan as well as a Jerusalem tradition came to exist; and according to this all the visions, excepting those at the very first, took place in Galilee, while the other refers them all to Jerusalem or its neighbourhood.[2] The common belief, meanwhile, was confirmed by the agreement of all as to the main fact of the resurrection. The disciples were one in the common faith, and fervently repeated among themselves, "He is risen!" The joy and enthusiasm of this harmony may have led to other visions; and to this time we may perhaps

[1] As to the name "Galilæans" given to the Christians, see below, p. 207 note 4.

[2] Matthew is exclusively Galilæan; Luke and the second Mark (xiv. 9–20) speak exclusively of Jerusalem; John combines the two. Paul also (1 Cor. xv. 5–8) refers to visions at places widely apart. That seen by "five hundred brethren" (which I have spoken of as if on the "mountain in Galilee") may possibly have taken place at or near Jerusalem.

refer that of James spoken of by Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7). The silence of the others regarding it is best explained by referring it to a period beyond that of their recital; and this we may infer, too, from the stress which Paul lays on the order of time. James, we may remember, was a brother of Jesus, or at least one of his near kindred; while it does not appear that he was with him during those last days in Jerusalem. He probably went thither with the rest when they returned from Galilee. All the leading apostles had had their vision, and "the Lord's brother" would hardly have been without his own. It was, we may suppose, an "eucharistic" vision, in which Jesus was seen in the act of breaking and distributing the bread.[1] In later years this vision was referred by those of the Christian family who adhered to James (called "the Hebrews") to the very day of the resurrection, and claimed by them to have been the first of all.[2]

It is a very notable circumstance that the family of Jesus, several of whom were incredulous or hostile during his life (John vii. 5), now take their place, and a high rank, in the Church. The reconciliation, we may suppose, took place during the retreat in Galilee. The name of their kinsman had of a sudden become famous, and the five hundred who believed in him and asserted that they had seen him after his resurrection, may have had an effect upon their minds.[3] As soon as the apostles are once fixed at Jerusalem, we find among them Mary the mother of Jesus, and his brothers.[4] Re-

[1] See Gospel of the Hebrews in Jerome, *De vir. ill.* 2; also Luke xxiv. 41–43.

[2] See Jerome, as above.

[3] May Gal. ii. 6 possibly allude to some such change as this?

[4] Acts i. 14. We already note in Luke a tendency to amplify the part borne by Mary: see the first two chapters of his Gospel.

garding Mary, John appears to have adopted her and lodged her in his own dwelling (John xix. 25–27), in obedience to a hint given him by his Master; and he may very probably have brought her back to Jerusalem. Although her personal traits and the part she sustained are very obscurely hinted, she now becomes a person of high consequence. The allusion to her in the blessing pronounced by an unknown woman, addressed to Jesus, "Blessed is the womb that bore thee, and the bosom that nourished thee," begin now to be fulfilled. She outlived her son, it is probable, but a few years; the tradition of her later abode at Ephesus being late and valueless.[1]

We are less sure as to the brothers of Jesus. It is true that he had brothers and sisters;[2] but among those who were later called his "brethren" there were doubtless more remote relations. The question is of importance only as concerning James the Just, "the Lord's brother," — whether a real brother or a cousin, son of Alpheus, — who held a very high position in the Church, as we shall see, through the first thirty years of our history. Our sources of information as to this are quite uncertain and contradictory. What we know of James shows an image so widely differing from that of Jesus, that we do not easily think of them as sons of the same mother. While the one was the true founder of Christianity, the other was its most dangerous foe, nearly ruining it by the narrowness of his spirit. There was, no doubt, a later belief that they were brothers,[3] but this may have been due to some confusion of names.

[1] Epiphan. lxxviii. 11; comp. "Life of Jesus," p. 392.

[2] See "Life of Jesus," pp. 92, 93.

[3] Gospel of the Hebrews, as just cited.

At all events, Jerusalem now becomes the abiding-place of the apostles,[1] which they quit, hereafter, only for short journeys. They seem to dread dispersion, and would seem to be taking precautions against a second return to Galilee, which would have broken up their little community. A special command of Jesus was reported, forbidding them to leave Jerusalem until the expected manifestations should have taken place.[2] Visions became more and more rare. They were seldom spoken of, and the belief began to prevail that the Master would be seen no more until his solemn reappearance in the clouds. Imagination dwelt rather on a promise which Jesus was believed to have made. During his life, it was said, he had often spoken of the Holy Spirit, as a personification of Divine Wisdom.[3] He had promised that this Spirit would be his disciples' strength in the conflicts they must encounter, their inspiration in difficulty, their advocate if they should have to meet a public charge. When the visions became fewer, they reverted to this Spirit, regarded as a Comforter, as a second self whom Jesus would send to his friends. Sometimes, it was said by way of symbol, Jesus would suddenly appear in the midst of his assembled followers, and breathe upon them from his own lips a stream of life-giving air (John xx. 22, 23). Or, again, his disappearance was thought of as the condition of the Holy Spirit's coming (*id.* xvi. 7). It was believed that in his manifestations he had promised the

[1] Acts viii. 1 ; Gal. i. 17–19; ii. 1–5.

[2] Luke xxiv. 49 ; Acts i. 4.

[3] This thought, it is true, is developed only in the Fourth Gospel (chaps. xiv.–xvi.) ; but it is hinted in Matt. iii. 11 ; Mark i. 8 ; Luke iii. 16 ; xii. 11, 12 ; xxiv. 49.

descent of the Spirit; and many closely associated this descent with the restoring of Israel's kingdom.[1] All that activity of fancy which had gone hitherto to create the legend of the risen Jesus, was now to be applied to the creation of a cycle of pious beliefs concerning the descent of the Holy Spirit among them, and the bestowal of miraculous gifts.

Meanwhile, a sublime manifestation of Jesus appears to have taken place at Bethany, or upon the Mount of Olives.[2] To this manifestation, according to some traditions, belong the final commissions, the promise of the Spirit, and the act investing the disciples with power to remit sins; while others refer this last gift to a previous vision (John xx. 23). The features in these manifestations become more indistinct, and one is sometimes confounded with another, till they cease to attract much attention. Jesus is assumed to be still living; and, this having been sufficiently established, he might be further manifest in partial visions, until his final coming.[3] Thus Paul represents the vision which appeared to him near Damascus as one in the same series that has now been related (1 Cor. xv. 8). In any case, the Master was regarded as being still ideally with his disciples, and so to be with them to the end.[4] In the earlier days, since Jesus often manifested himself, he

[1] Luke xxiv. 49; Acts i. 4, 5–8.

[2] 1 Cor. xv. 7; Luke xxiv. 50–53; Acts i. 2–5. We may, indeed, regard the vision at Bethany, related by Luke, as parallel with that upon the mountain told in Matt. xxviii. 16–20; but this latter is not accompanied by the ascension. A like manifestation in Mark xvi. 9–20, with the final commission, is placed at Jerusalem. Paul, again, represents the appearance to "all the apostles" as distinct from that to "five hundred of the brethren" (1 Cor. xv. 5–7).

[3] Luke xxiv. 23; Acts xxv. 19.

[4] Matt. xxviii. 20.

was conceived as still dwelling upon the earth, more or less under the conditions of earthly life. As the visions became infrequent, he was conceived under another figure, as having entered into his glory, and as seated at the right hand of his Father. The belief about him was, that "he is ascended into heaven."

This phrase, indeed, was often used as mere vague imagery or dogma;[1] but many understood it as signifying a material scene, holding that, after his last appearance to all the apostles, and his final commission to them, Jesus in bodily form was taken into heaven.[2] The scene of this was afterwards expanded and made into a complete legend. It was said that celestial personages, in dazzling raiment (recalling the scene of the transfiguration) appeared at the moment when the cloud enfolded him, and consoled the disciples by assuring them that he would return with glory in the clouds just as he had parted from them. The death of Moses had been shrouded by popular imagination in the like mystery;[3] the ascension of Elijah in a fiery chariot was also brought to mind.[4] Luke places the scene of the ascension near Bethany, on the summit of the Mount of Olives, — this region being held peculiarly dear among the disciples, because Jesus had lived there.

According to the legend, the disciples after this scene of marvel returned to Jerusalem "with great joy" (Luke xxiv. 52). But for us it is a sad thing to take

[1] John iii. 13; vi. 62; xvi. 7; xx. 17; Eph. iv. 10; 1 Pet. iii. 22; neither Matthew nor John having related the scene of ascension, while the language of Paul (1 Cor. xv. 7, 8) seems to exclude the very idea.

[2] Mark xiv. 19; Luke xxiv. 50–52; Acts i. 2–12; Justin, *Apol.* i. 50; Asc. of Isaiah, Ethiopic vers. xi. 22; Latin vers. (Venice, 1522).

[3] Jos. *Antiq.* iv. 8: 48.

[4] 2 Kings, ii. 11–13.

our last farewell of Jesus, as it has been a consolation to find him once more living in his shadowy life. Pale image as it is of his former existence, it has yet its charm. But henceforth the fragrance of his presence is gone. Borne upon a cloud to his Father's right hand, he leaves us among men: and what a fall is there! The realm of poetry is past. The Magdalene broods upon her memories in the village to which she is withdrawn. With that unvarying injustice which causes man to claim to himself alone the glory of a task where woman has an equal share, Cephas casts her into the shadow, to be forgotten. No more sermons on the mount! no more healing of demoniacs, or pardon of the sinful; no more of those female fellow-workers to whom He never refused a share in the task of redemption. The divinity has disappeared from the scene. Christian history will hereafter tell oftenest how the idea of Jesus has been betrayed. Still, that history is a tribute to his glory. The words and the person of the exalted Nazarene remain as a sublime ideal in the midst of boundless wretchedness. We shall better understand his greatness when we contrast it with the littleness of those who called themselves his disciples.

CHAPTER IV.

DESCENT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. — A. D. 34.

Petty, narrow, ignorant, void of experience, those disciples were, as much as man can be. Their minds were simple and credulous to the last degree. But they had one noble quality; their affection to their Master was without bounds. His memory had remained the one motive power of their life. By it they were wholly possessed; and henceforth, it was clear, they would live only through him who for two or three years had so won them and attached them to himself. For minds of the second order — unable to find God directly, that is, to know the true or achieve the beautiful or do the good by their own strength — salvation must be had by love of some one who shall reflect to them the lustre of the true, beautiful, and good. Most men have need to worship at a little distance. The multitude of adorers need an intermediary between themselves and God.

At the death of one who has drawn about him a group of others, closely united in one lofty moral purpose, it will often happen that the others, hitherto sundered by personal rivalries and dissent, feel all the more deeply their mutual tie of fellowship. Cherished memories of the departed leader make their common treasure. To love one another is but one form of the love they bore to him; and they crave to meet together, that those precious memories may be renewed. That pro-

found word of Jesus is literally fulfilled: "Where two or three are met in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20).

Thus the mutual affection of the disciples was tenfold what it had been during the Master's life. They formed a little company, apart from others, living exclusively among themselves. About one hundred and twenty of them were in Jerusalem (Acts i. 15). The greater part of the "five hundred" were doubtless still in Galilee. The later number "three thousand" (Acts ii. 41) must be an exaggeration, or at least anticipates the fact. Their piety was zealous, and as yet the form it took was wholly Jewish. The Temple was their chief place of worship.[1] It is certain that they worked for their living; but, among Jews of that day, manual labour consumed little time. Every one had a trade, which need no way hinder him from being a man of scholarship or breeding. Among us material wants are so hard to satisfy that one living by hand-work is forced to toil twelve or fifteen hours a day. Only the man of leisure can give thought to interests of the soul, and to acquire learning is a rare and costly thing. But in those communities of old — of which the East still offers the example, — in a climate where nature lavishes so much upon man and demands so little from him, the toiler's life left him much time to spare. A kind of instruction open to everybody diffused among all the common stock of thought. Nothing was needed but "food and raiment;"[2] and these were earned by a very few hours of toil. The rest was given over to dream,

[1] Luke xxiv. 53; Acts ii. 46; comp. Luke ii. 37; Hegesippus in Euseb. ii. 23.

[2] Deut. x. 18; 1 Tim. vi. 8.

to passion; and in these souls passion bore sway to a degree which we find inconceivable. The Jews of that time — so Josephus shows them in his story of their war — are in our eyes veritable madmen: each, like a spring let loose in blind recoil, obeys the thought of the instant as it has seized him.

The ruling thought in the Christian community at this moment, when visions had but just ceased, was the coming of the Holy Spirit, to be received in the form of a mysterious breath that should pass upon all the company (John xx. 22). All sense of inward comfort, every impulse of courage, every outburst of enthusiasm, every soft and warm emotion of gladness coming one knew not from what source, was the operation of the Spirit.[1] These honest hearts referred (as ever) to an outward source the delicious emotions that sprang up within them. The strange phenomena of illuminism were especially frequent in their assemblies. When all were gathered, silently waiting inspiration from on high, a slight murmur or any sound might make them believe in the coming of the Spirit. It was thus, formerly, that the presence of Jesus was announced. Now that the current of thought was altered, it was the Divine breath poured out upon the little Church, and filling the place with celestial odours.

The symbolic form in which these beliefs were clothed was one familiar in the Old Testament. In Hebraic language, the prophetic spirit is a "breath" which at once penetrates and uplifts. In the noble vision of Elijah, the Lord's presence was expressed by "a still

[1] So in the modern hymn:—

> And every virtue we possess, and every victory won,
> And every thought of holiness, are His alone. — Ed.

small voice" (1 Kings, xix. 12). These old images had brought about, in later times, a belief very like that of the Spiritism of our days. In the "Ascension of Isaiah," early in the second Christian century, the coming of the Spirit is attended by a shaking of the doors (vi. 6). Still oftener, this coming was conceived as a second baptism, that of the Spirit, far superior to that of John.[1] Delusions of touch were very frequent among persons so nervously excited; and thus the slightest breath of air, with any shiver in the midst of silence, was regarded as the passing of the Spirit. One thinks he feels it; presently all feel it;[2] and the enthusiasm spreads from each to the next. We see how like these experiences are to those of visionaries in every age. They are witnessed every day, often the effect of reading the Book of Acts, among the Quakers, English or American, the Jumpers, Shakers, Irvingites, or Mormons, or in American camp-meetings and revivals,[3] also among the Spiritists of France. But there is a wide interval between such aimless and endless aberrations as these, and those illusions which came with the establishing of a new gospel for mankind.

Among these "descents of the Spirit," which seem to have been numerous, one has left a profound impression upon the Church then coming to its birth.[4] On one occasion a storm burst forth while the brethren were assembled; a strong wind blew open the casements, and the sky was as it were in flames. Thunder-

[1] Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5; xi. 16; xix. 4; 1 John v. 6–8.

[2] Comp. Misson, *le Théâtre sacré des Cévennes*, p. 103.

[3] Jules Remy, *Voyage*, etc. i. 259, 260; ii. 470 *et seq.*

[4] Acts ii. 1–4; Justin. *Apol.* i. 50.

storms in this region are accompanied by prodigious flashes of light, and the air seems to be furrowed all about by streaks of flame. Whether the lightning actually passed within the chamber, or a dazzling flash suddenly lighted up the faces of all, they were persuaded that the Spirit had entered and rested as a "tongue of fire" on each head.[1] The miracle-working (theurgic) schools of Syria held that the entrance of the Spirit is by a divine fire, and under the form of a mysterious gleam.[2] It was as if they were present at the very splendours of Sinai;[3] the manifestation was, as it were, one of the ancient day. Henceforth, "baptism of the Spirit" is also a baptism of fire; and it is distinctly opposed to and set above John's baptism of water only.[4] It is given, too, but rarely; only the apostles, who had shared in the first institution of the Eucharist, were thought to have received it. But the idea that the Spirit had hovered over them in the form of jets of flame, like burning tongues, was the origin of singular ideas, very prominent in the fancies of the time.

The tongue of the inspired man was thought to receive a sort of consecration. It was asserted that many prophets, before their mission, had been stammerers;[5] that the angel of the Lord had touched their lips with a live coal,[6] which removed all impurity and bestowed

[1] In Hebrew a "tongue of fire" is simply a flame; see Isa. v. 24; Virgil, *Æn.* ii. 682–684.

[2] See Iamblichus, *De myst.* iii. 6.

[3] Comp. Babyl. Talm., *Chagiga*, 14 *b*; *Midrashim*, *Shir hasshirin rabba*, 10 *b*; *Ruth rabba*, 42 *a*; *Koheleth rabba*, 87 *a*.

[4] Matt. iii. 11; Luke iii. 16.

[5] Exod. iv. 10; Jer. i. 6.

[6] Isa. vi. 5; Jer. i. 9.

the gift of eloquence. In his public appeals the prophet was thought never to speak of himself,[1] his tongue being but the organ of the Deity who inspired him. These tongues of fire were held to be a striking symbol. It was believed that God had chosen thus to signify that he poured out upon the apostles his most precious gifts of eloquence and inspiration. But this was not all. Jerusalem, like most cities of the East, was a city of many tongues. Now difference in speech was one of the gravest difficulties in the spread of a universal faith. Nothing was more alarming to the apostles, setting out on a mission that was to embrace the earth, than the number of languages spoken in it: ever they must question with themselves how they should learn so many dialects. Thus "the gift of tongues" became a miraculous privilege. The preaching of the gospel was thus relieved of the obstacle created by diverse idioms. In circumstances of special solemnity, it may be supposed that the bystanders had heard the apostles' preaching each man in his own tongue; that is, their word *translated itself* to each one of those present.[2] Sometimes, indeed, it was understood differently: that the apostles, by divine inspiration, had the gift of knowing all languages and speaking them at will.[3]

In this there was the hint of a larger freedom. The thought implied in it is that the Gospel has not a special dialect of its own; that it may be translated into

[1] Luke xi. 12; John xiv. 26.

[2] Acts ii. 5–13. This is the most plausible understanding of the account, which may, however, mean that each of the dialects was spoken independently by each of the speakers.

[3] Acts ii. 4; 1 Cor. xii. 10, 28; xiv. 21, 22. Comp. for illustration Calmeil, *De la folie*, i. 9, 262; ii. 357 *et seq.*

every language, and that the translation is as good as the original. But such was not the feeling of Jewish orthodoxy. For the Jew of Jerusalem Hebrew is the one "holy tongue;" no other can take its place. Translations of the Bible were held in small esteem. While the Hebrew text was scrupulously kept the same, changes and softenings were allowed in translations. Jews in Egypt and Hellenists in Palestine, it is true, allowed themselves more freedom, employing Greek in prayer,[1] and habitually reading Greek translations of the Bible. But the earliest Christian idea was broader yet: that the word of God has no special language, but is free of all linguistic fetters, yielding itself to all of its own accord, and needing no interpreter. The ease with which Christianity released itself from the Semitic dialect spoken by Jesus, the freedom which it allowed to every people of forming its own liturgy and its version of the Bible in its own native tongue, all made a part of this emancipation. It was generally held that the Messiah would bring into one all languages as well as all peoples.[2] The common and indifferent employment of various tongues made the first step toward this grand era of universal peace.

But it was not long before the gift of tongues took a new form and ran into the strangest extravagances. A sort of delirium would sometimes lead to ecstasy and prophesying. At such times the true believer, in the seizure of the Spirit, would utter inarticulate and incoherent sounds, which others would take for words in a strange tongue, and attempt in all simplicity to

[1] Jerus. Talmud, *Sota*, 21 *b*.

[2] Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: Judah, 25.

translate their meaning.[1] At other times, it was thought that the person inspired spoke in languages new, hitherto unknown, or even, it might be, in the tongue of angels.[2] In general, these strange scenes did not occur till later ;[3] but it is likely that they were not unknown from the beginning. Visions of the ancient prophets had often been attended by symptoms of nervous excitement (1 Sam. xix. 23, 24). The condition called among the Greeks dithyrambic was signalised by like phenomena; and the Pythia sometimes preferred to use foreign or archaic expressions, which as in the early Church, were called "tongues" (γλῶσσαι).[4] Many current phrases in primitive Christianity, bilingual or in anagram, — such as *Abba Father*, *Anathema Maranatha*,[5] may have had their origin in these moments of frenzy, accompanied by sighs, stifled groans, outcries, supplications, and sudden bursts, which were taken to be prophetical. It was like a formless music of the soul, uttered in inarticulate sounds, which the hearers tried to render into precise words or images;[6] or, again, prayers of the spirit, addressed to God in words known to him alone,[7] the person in ecstasy having neither understanding nor consciousness of what he said.[8] He was

[1] Acts ii. 4; x. 44–48; xi. 15; xix. 6; 1 Cor. xii.–xiv.

[2] Mark xvi. 17; 1 Cor. xiii. 1 (in connection with what precedes). In Hebrew, as in all ancient languages, the word for "strange" or "foreign tongue" was derived from those meaning "to stammer" or "babble," since to simple peoples the speech of foreigners seems a confused babblement. See Isa. xxviii. 11; xxxiii. 19; 1 Cor. xiv. 21.

[3] 1 Cor. xii. 28, 30; xiv. 2–5.

[4] Plutarch, *De Pythiæ oraculis*, 24. See also the strange vocables employed by Cassandra in her ravings: Æschylus, *Agamemnon*, 1072 *et seq.*

[5] 1 Cor. xiii. 3; xvi. 22; Rom. viii. 15, 23, 26, 27.

[6] 1 Cor. xiii. 1; xiv. 7–11.

[7] Rom. viii. 26, 27.

[8] 1 Cor. xiv. 13, 14, 27–32.

eagerly listened to, meanwhile, and his incoherent utterance was explained by such thoughts as might occur at the moment. Each hearer caught at something he might recall in his own provincial speech, to interpret the unintelligible sounds; and he always succeeded, for better or worse, by supplying to this broken speech the thought that was just then wakened in his mind.

The history of the sects of *illuminati* is full of just such instances. The preachers of the Cevennes exhibited many a case of "glossolalia."[1] But the most striking example is that of the Swedish "Readers" of 1841-43.[2] Involuntary words, void of meaning to those who speak them, attended by swooning and convulsions, were long a daily practice in this sect, and grew contagious, so as to stir considerable popular excitement. Among the Irvingites the phenomena of tongues repeated in a very striking way what is told by Luke and Paul.[3] Our own time has witnessed scenes of similar illusion which I need not here recall, since it is always unjust to compare the credulity inevitable in a great religious movement with that which originates in mere emptiness of mind.

These strange displays would sometimes find their way out-doors. Enthusiasts, at the moment of their highest, strangest ecstasy, would venture out and exhibit themselves before the crowd, and so were taken to be intoxicated (Acts ii. 13, 15). Jesus, himself, though

[1] Jurieu, *Lettres pastorales:* Misson, *le Théâtre*, etc., *pass.;* Brueys, *Hist. du fanatisme*, i. 145 *et seq.;* Fléchier, *Lettres choisies*, i. 353.

[2] K. Hase, *Kirchengesch.* §§ 439, 458:5; *L'Espérance* (Prot. journal), 1 April, 1847.

[3] Hohl, *Bruchstücke*, etc., 145, 149; Hase, § 458:4. See also the various accounts of the Mormons and the *Convulsionnaires* of St. Médard (Remy; Carré de Montgeron).

ordinarily of well-balanced mind, more than once exhibited the usual signs of ecstasy.[1] For two or three years the disciples were possessed with these ideas. The exercise of prophecy was reckoned akin to the gift of tongues.[2] Prayer, accompanied with violent gestures, intoning of the voice, profound sighs, lyric enthusiasm, and a chanting method of delivery,[3] was of daily frequency. A rich vein of canticles, psalms, and hymns, borrowed from the Old Testament, thus lay open.[4] Heart and lips might join in the act of praise, but at times the lips were silent, the heart alone engaged in prayer.[5] Since no language contained terms to express the new emotion, there came about the practice of an inarticulate stammering, at once childish and sublime, the embryonic condition of what we may call "the Christian language." Christianity, in fact, had broken the mould of the ancient tongues, not finding in them an instrument suited to its needs. But, before it could shape out the idiom it required, centuries must pass, while many of its obscure efforts might be described as an inarticulate moaning. The style of Paul, and that in many of the New Testament writings, suggests that cramped, panting, shapeless improvisation called "the gift of tongues." Ordinary speech breaks down under these men. They know not how to speak, and must begin, like the prophets, by the infant's cry of "Ah!" (Jer. i. 6). The Greek and the Semitic tongues fail them alike: hence the violences done to language by

[1] Mark iii. 21–25; John x. 20, 21; xii. 27–29.

[2] Acts xix. 6; 1 Cor. xiv. 3–5.

[3] Acts x. 46; 1 Cor. xiv. 15, 16, 26.

[4] Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19; Luke, chaps. i., ii. (cf. Luke i. 46 with Acts x. 46).

[5] 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19.

Christianity in its cradle. As in the mouth of one who stammers, the sounds hustle and choke one another, resulting in a confused but very expressive pantomime.

All this was far, indeed, from the thought of Jesus; but such exhibitions had profound meaning to minds steeped in belief of the supernatural. The gift of tongues was regarded, in especial, as an essential sign of the new religion and a witness to its truth (Mark xvi. 17). And in truth great fruits of edification were found in it, with the conversion of many pagans.[1] Until the third century, the gift of tongues continued to be manifest in the way described by Paul, and was regarded as a permanent miracle.[2] Some of the sublime phrases of Christian imagery had their birth in these "groanings which cannot be uttered" (Rom. viii. 26). Their general effect was to touch and penetrate the soul. Thus to make common property of one's individual inspirations, submitting them to be interpreted by the general thought, must unfailingly create a powerful bond of brotherhood.

Like all mystics, these new brethren led a life of fasting and self-denial.[3] Like most Orientals, they ate sparingly, and this aided to sustain their exalted mood. The sober Syrian regimen, causing physical weakness, promotes a perpetual condition of fever and nervous susceptibility. That sustained effort of the brain common among us would be impossible under such a regimen. On the other hand, this cere-

[1] 1 Cor. xiv. 22. "Spirit," in Paul's epistles, is often nearly one with "power." Thus Spiritist phenomena are regarded as miracles.

[2] Iren. *Adv. hær.* v. 6:1; Tertull. *Adv. Marcion*, v. 8; *Constit. Apost.* viii. i.

[3] Luke ii. 37; 2 Cor. vi. 5; xi. 27.

bral and muscular debility brings, without apparent cause, alternations of gloom and joy, which incessantly throw the soul back on God. What is called a "godly sorrow" (ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη: 2 Cor. vii. 10) was reckoned a celestial gift. The entire doctrine of the great Eastern Fathers regarding the spiritual life, all the secrets of that great art of dealing with the inward experience, — among the most glorious creations of Christianity, — may be found in germ in that strange condition of the soul undergone, in their months of anxious waiting, by these illustrious forerunners of "men of the spirit." To us their moral state is a strange thing, — living in the supernatural, acting only as in vision, and holding their dreams, the minutest circumstances of their lives, to be monitions from the heavenly powers.[1]

Under the phrase "gifts of the Holy Spirit" were thus hidden the rarest and most exquisite conditions of the soul, — love, piety, a reverent fear, unbidden sighs, sudden yieldings to emotion, a spontaneous tenderness. Whatever of good is found in man that can be traced to no human source was ascribed to a breath from above. Tears, especially, were held to be a sign of celestial favour. This lovely grace, privilege only of the best and purest souls, belonged to boundless gentleness of heart. It is well known what strength delicate natures, women especially, have found in the divine gift of copious tears. It is for such one form of prayer, and surely the holiest of prayers. Coming down far into the later Middle Age, to the tear-flooded piety of Saints Bruno, Bernard, and Francis of Assisi,

[1] Acts viii. 26–28; x. throughout; xvi. 6, 7, 9, 10; Luke ii. 27–32.

we find again that chastened sadness of the early days, when those words were so proved true, that "they who sow in tears shall reap in joy." Weeping thus became an act of piety; and those who had no skill to preach, or speak in tongues, or perform acts of miracle, might at least shed tears. And this they did in prayer, in preaching, in warning;[1] it was the advent of a reign of tears. One might have said that the very soul was dissolving, and, in lack of a language adequate to the emotion, would spend itself abroad in a living and condensed expression of its whole interior life.

[1] Acts xx. 19, 31; Rom. viii. 23, 26.

CHAPTER V.

THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH A COMMUNITY. — A. D. 35.

The habit of living together, in one faith and purpose, naturally brought about many a common custom. Rules were soon established, which made the primitive Church very like those institutions of monastic life, afterward familiar in Christian history. Many precepts of Jesus led in this direction. The true ideal of life in the gospels is monastic, — not a monastery shut in with gratings, a prison, such as in the Middle Age, with separation of the sexes; but a retreat amid the world, a space set apart for the life of the spirit, a free association or little intimate brotherhood, fenced about to exclude the anxieties which harm the freedom of the divine kingdom.

All lived accordingly in common, having but one heart and one mind.[1] No one of them had anything which he called his own. In becoming disciples of Jesus, they sold their goods and brought in the price as a gift to the community, the leaders then distributing the common fund to each according to his need. They lived in a quarter by themselves.[2] They partook of a common meal, still ascribing to it the mystic sense which Jesus had ordained.[3] Long hours were spent in prayers, sometimes uttered aloud, oftener in silent meditation.

[1] Acts ii. 42–47; iv. 32–37; v. 1–11; vi. 1–4.
[2] Acts ii. 44–47.
[3] Ibid. ii. 46; xx. 7, 11.

Ecstasies were common, and all believed themselves to be continually favoured by divine inspiration. Harmony was perfect, with no doctrinal dispute and no strife for precedence. All such differences were blotted out by the tender memory of Jesus. In every heart was a deep and living joy.[1] Morality was strict, but softened by a warm and tender feeling. Groups met in private houses for prayer or indulgence of religious emotions. The memory of these two or three first years remained among them as of an earthly paradise, which was henceforth to be sought in the dreams of Christendom, but was never to return. Such an organisation, in truth, could be realised only by a very small brotherhood; though later it was the ideal of monastic life, which the Church at large made no effort to attain.

It is quite possible that the writer of "Acts," to whom we owe this picture of primitive Christianity, has more or less qualified the colouring, and, in particular, has overstated the community of goods it practised. With this writer, who also composed the Third Gospel, facts are often warped by theory,[2] and the tendency to *ebionism*[3] — that is, absolute poverty — is often strongly marked. Still, his account cannot be without foundation. Even if Jesus never uttered the communistic maxims recorded by the third evangelist, it is certain that the renunciation of this world's goods, and almsgiving carried to the extreme of self-denial, were perfectly in keeping with the tone of his discourse. Belief in the

[1] In no other literature is the word "joy" so often found as in the New Testament. See 1 Thess. i. 6; v. 16; Rom. xiv. 17; xv. 13; Gal. v. 22; Phil. i. 25; iii. 1; iv. 4; 1 John i. 4, etc.

[2] See "Life of Jesus," Introd. p. 64. [3] Ibid. p. 211.

near end of the world has always had the effect to promote disgust of wealth and a tendency to communism.[1] The account in "Acts" is, further, in perfect keeping with what we know of the origin of other ascetic religions, — Buddhism, for example, — which always begin with cenobitic [or communistic] life, their first adepts being a sort of mendicant monks. A lay body is not apparent in such movements until a later period, or when the religion has conquered an entire political community, in which monastic life is necessarily an exception.[2]

We find, then, a communistic period in the history of the Church at Jerusalem. Even two centuries later, pagan writers[3] found in Christianity some traces of a communistic sect. It is to be remembered that the Essenes and Therapeutæ had already given a model of this way of life, which was a quite legitimate offshoot of Mosaism. Since the Mosaic code was in its essence moral and not political, its natural effect was to yield a social utopia (the church, synagogue, or convent), not a civil State, — the nation or municipality. Egypt had for some centuries maintained recluses, some of them at public expense (probably in administering of charitable endowments) near the Serapeum at Memphis.[4]

[1] An example [greatly exaggerated by some historians] is found in the "legend" of the year 1000, when acts of donation to monasteries, etc., often began with the formula, "Whereas the end of the world draws near." [But see *Revue politique et littéraire* for March, 1878.]

[2] See Hodgson in the Asiatic Journal of the Society of Bengal, v. 33 *et seq.*; Burnouf, *Introd. à l'hist. de buddhisme indien*, i. 278.

[3] As Lucian, in the *Death of Peregrinus*, 13.

[4] See papyruses at Turin, London, and Paris, collected by Brunet de Presle; *Mém. sur le Serap. de Memphis*, Paris, 1852; Egger, *Mém. d'hist. anc. et de philologie*, 151; *Notices et extraits*, xviii.: ii. 264–369. Christian asceticism, it is to be noted, originated in Egypt.

Such a life in the East is by no means what it has been among Western peoples. In the East one may well enjoy nature and life without property of any sort. Here man is always free because his wants are few; the slavery of labour is unknown. It may well be that the communism of the primitive Church was not so rigid as we find it in the Book of Acts. It is, however, sure that there was at Jerusalem a great brotherhood of poor, ruled by the apostles, to which donations were sent from all points where churches were established.[1] This brotherhood was, no doubt, obliged to establish very strict rules; and, within a few years, may have been compelled to enforce its regulations by terror. Fearful memories remained, showing that the mere fault of keeping back a part of what one gave to the community was regarded as a capital offence, and was in fact punished by death, as we see in the story of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v. 1–11).

The porches of the Temple, especially Solomon's Porch, overlooking the valley of Kedron, was the usual place of assembling for the disciples in the daytime,[2] recalling as it did the memory of hours which Jesus had passed there. They were little noticed in the hubbub that prevailed about the Temple. The galleries that made a feature in the structure were the seats of numerous sects and schools, the scenes of endless disputes. The followers of Jesus, too, must have appeared as very strict devotees, for they scrupulously kept the Jewish observances, prayed at appointed hours (iii. 1), and followed the precepts of the Law. They were

[1] Acts xi. 29, 30; xxiv. 17; Gal. ii. 10; Rom. xv. 26–29; 1 Cor. xvi. 1–4; 2 Cor. viii. ix.

[2] Acts ii. 46; v. 12.

Jews, differing from the rest only in the belief that the Messiah had come already. The majority, who knew nothing of their peculiar views, would regard them as a sect of the *Hasidim*, or "pious." To affiliate with them did not make one a heretic or schismatic, as we see in the case of James, who continued to be a pure Jew all his life, any more than one ceases to be a Protestant by becoming a disciple of Spener [the father of Pietism], or a Catholic by joining the order of St. Francis or St. Bruno [founder of the Carthusian order]. They were favourites of the people because of their piety, simplicity, and gentleness,[1] while the aristocrats of the Temple would no doubt regard them with displeasure. But the sect made little noise; it was left in peace, safe in its obscurity.

At night the brethren would return to their quarter and partake of the repast, divided into groups (ii. 46), as a sign of fraternity and in memory of their Master, whom they always beheld as present in the midst. The master of the feast broke the bread, blessed the cup,[2] and passed it, as a symbol of union in Jesus. The commonest act of life thus became the most august and sacred. These family feasts, always dear to the Jews,[3] were accompanied with prayers, pious ejaculations, and gladness of heart. They felt as if still animated by the presence of Jesus, or in very sight of him; and the saying was early common among them, that Jesus had said, "Whenever you break bread, do it in remembrance of me."[4] Even the bread itself was a symbolic type of

[1] Acts ii. 47; iv. 33; v. 13, 26.
[2] 1 Cor. x. 16; Justin, *Apol.* i. 65–67.
[3] Συνδεῖπνα, Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10: 8, 12.
[4] Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24–26; Justin, *loc. cit.*

him, regarded as the one source of life effective for those who had loved him and still derived their life from him. These repasts, which were always the chief symbol of Chistianity and the soul of its mysteries, — for in the year 57 the eucharist had (1 Cor. xi. 17–22) become a practice already old and full of abuses, — at first were held every evening. Soon, however, they were restricted to Sunday evening;[1] and, later, the mystic Supper was transferred to the morning.[2] At the period of time we have now reached, Christians still observed their chief festal rite on Saturday.[3]

The apostles chosen by Jesus, and still held to have received from him a special commission to proclaim the divine kingdom to the world, held an unquestioned superiority in the little community. One of the first cares, as soon as the company found themselves established at Jerusalem, was to fill up the void in the body left by Judas Iscariot (i. 15–26). It came to be a more and more general opinion that he had betrayed his Master and brought about his death. In this belief legend had its share, and daily some new circumstance came to light which deepened the blackness of his crime. He had, it was said, bought a field near the old burial-ground Akeldama, and was living there in seclusion.[4] Such was the strained state of mind in the little community, that to fill his place they had recourse to lot. This method of decision is often resorted to under the stress of religious feeling, in the conviction that

[1] Acts xx. 7, 11; Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97; Justin, *Apol.* i. 67.

[2] Justin (as above).

[3] The contrary cannot be shown from John xx. 26. The Ebionites always observed the Jewish Sabbath (Jer. *In Matt.* xiii.).

[4] See "Life of Jesus," p. 405.

LBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

nothing happens by chance, that the believer is himself a special object of Divine care, and that, the weaker man is, the larger part is left to God. The only condition was that the candidates should be of the older company of disciples, — who had witnessed the whole series of events since the baptism of John, the choice being thus among a very few. Only two were upon the list, — Joseph Bar-Saba, called "the Just," and Matthias.[1] The lot fell to the latter, who thereafter was reckoned among the Twelve. This, however, was the only instance of such a substitution. The apostles were held to have been appointed by Jesus, once for all, to have no successors. A profound instinct averted, for a time, the peril of a permanent college, or commission, holding in itself the life and strength of the whole body. It was long before the Church became thus reduced within the control of an oligarchy.

We must be on our guard, besides, against a misunderstanding to which the name "apostle" is liable, which it has in fact incurred. In very old time, partly by certain passages of the gospels and still more by the analogies in the life of Paul, the apostles were regarded as essentially travelling envoys, in a sense dividing the world among themselves in advance, and setting forth to conquer all the earth.[2] A cycle of legends arose upon this presumption, and was fastened upon Christian history.[3] Nothing is more contrary to the truth.[4] The Twelve usually abode in permanence at Jerusalem. Until the year 60, or thereabout, the apostles never left that place except for temporary missions: hence the obscurity in which the majority of them remained.

[1] See Papias in Euseb. iii. 39.

[2] Justin, *Apol.* i. 39, 50.

[3] Pseudo-Abdias, etc.

[4] 1 Cor. xv. 10; Rom. xv. 19.

Few of them had any leading part. They made a sort of sacred college, or senate (Gal. i. 17, 19), to which was intrusted the keeping of the conservative tradition. At length they were relieved of all active responsibility, their only function being to preach and pray (Acts vi. 4), and not even the more effective share in preaching fell to them. Their names were hardly known outside of Jerusalem; and the apostolic lists, current in 70 or 80 scarcely agreed excepting as to the best-known names.[1]

The "brethren of Jesus" often appear in connection with the "apostles," though they were quite distinct from them;[2] and their authority was at least equal. The two groups formed a sort of aristocracy in the body, grounded on their greater or less intimacy with the Master. These were the men whom Paul called "pillars" (Gal. ii. 9) of the church at Jerusalem. We see, however, that ranks in the church hierarchy did not yet exist. The title was nothing, personal importance was all. Celibacy in the priesthood already existed in principle,[3] but time was yet needed for its full development. Peter and Philip were married, and had sons and daughters.[4]

The assembly of the faithful was called in Hebrew *kahal*, which was rendered in Greek by the essentially democratic term ἐκκλησία, *ecclesia*, which in the old Greek cities signified the *summons* of the people to their gathering in the Pnyx or Agora. Such terms, used

[1] Matt. x. 2–4; Mark iii. 16–19; Luke vi. 14–16; Acts i. 13.

[2] Acts i. 14; Gal. i. 19; 1 Cor. ix. 5.

[3] See "Life of Jesus," p. 307.

[4] See "Life of Jesus," p. 187; Papias in Euseb. iii. 39; Polycrates, *ib.* v. 24; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* iii. 6, vii. 11.

by the Athenian democracy, had come, since the second or third century B. C., to be of a certain common right in the Hellenic tongue; some of them — as ἐπίσκοπος (*bishop*), and perhaps κλῆρος (*lot, clergy*),[1] were adopted in Christian use through their employment by Greek fraternities. It was, in fact, a mode of popular life, restrained for centuries, which thus resumed its course under other forms. The primitive Church was, in its way, a petty democracy. It resumes all the old democratic forms, even the election by lot, so dear to the ancient republics.[2] It was, however, far less harsh and jealous than those, readily delegating its authority to its chosen officers. It tended, like all theocratic associations, to leave all power with the clergy; and, as might easily be seen, within a century or two this new democracy was sure to grow into an oligarchy.

The power conferred on the assembled Church and on its leaders was very great. Every mission was by Church appointment, and was subject only to indications given by the Spirit.[3] Its authority extended even to passing the death-sentence. At the word of Peter, it is related (Acts v. 1–11), the guilty had been known to have fallen and died upon the spot. A little later Paul does not flinch, in judgment of one guilty of incest, "to deliver him to Satan for the death of the body," while hoping that "his spirit may be saved in the great day of the Lord" (1 Cor. v. 3–5). Excommunication was held equivalent to a sentence of death. It was not doubted that one whom the apostles or heads of the Church had cut off from the body of the saints

[1] See Wescher, in *Revue Archéol.* for April, 1866, and below, p. 287.

[2] Acts i. 26; and below, p. 353.

[3] Acts xiii. 1–5; Clem. Alex. in Euseb. iii. 23.

and given over to the power of the Evil One (1 Tim. i. 20) would perish. Satan was regarded as the author of disease; and to give up to him a gangrened limb was to give it over to the fit executioner of the sentence. An untimely death was commonly supposed to be the effect of these secret sentences, which, in the strong Hebrew expression, "cut off a soul from his people" (Gen. xvii. 14).[1] The apostles believed themselves to be endowed with superhuman rights. In pronouncing condemnation, they thought that their anathema could not fail to be followed by the effect.

The terrible impression caused by excommunication, and the universal hate felt towards the members thus cut off, might, in fact, bring about their death in many cases, or at least force the excommunicated person into exile. The same dreadful double meaning is found in the ancient Law: to extirpate (or "root out") might imply either death or expulsion from the community, exile or a solitary and mysterious deed of violence; as "to exterminate" is in its first meaning "to put beyond the bounds."[2] To kill the apostate or blasphemer, to strike the body so as to save the soul, must seem quite legitimate. We must remember that we are in the age of Zealots, who considered it an act of virtue to stab any one faithless to the Law;[3] and that some of the Christians were or had been Zealots.[4] Stories like that of the death of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts v.

[1] See Mishna *Kerithouth*, i. 1; Babyl. Talm. *Moëd katon*, 28 *a*; Tertull. *De anima*, 57.

[2] See the Hebrew or Rabbinic lexicon at the word כרת, *to cut off*.

[3] Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, ix. 6; John xvi. 2; Jos. *War*, vii. 8: 1; 3 Macc. (apocr.), vii. 8, 12, 13 [Compare Balfour of Burley, in Scott's "Old Mortality."]

[4] Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13; comp. Matt. x. 4; Mark iii. 18.

1–11) or the blinding of Elymas the sorcerer (*id.* xiii 9–11) would stir no scruple. The idea of civil power was so strange to this community outside of Roman Law, — such was the persuasion which held the Church to be a social order, complete and self-sufficient, — that no one saw in a miracle entailing death or mutilation an act punishable by public authority. Enthusiasm and an ardent faith screened all, excused all. But the frightful danger to the future hidden in these theocratic maxims is easy to detect. When the Church is armed with a sword, excommunication becomes a sentence of death. Henceforth there is a power outside the State, which disposes of the citizen's life. Roman authority would surely have been in the right, if it had restrained itself to holding such criminal principles in check among Jews and Christians. Only, in the brutal exercise of power, it confounded the liberty of worship, the most rightful of liberties, with abuses which no political society can endure with impunity.

Peter seems to have had a certain leadership among the apostles in virtue of his zeal and activity.[1] At first he is hardly to be found apart from John the son of Zebedee. They almost always went together,[2] and their close union was doubtless a corner-stone of the new faith. James, the Lord's brother, almost equalled them in authority, at least with a portion of the Church. Certain near friends of Jesus, as the Galilæan women and the family of Bethany, disappear from our account, as I have already said. These faithful women, less careful of organisation and outward form, were content to mourn as dead him whom they had loved while living.

[1] Acts i. 15; ii. 14, 37; v. 3, 29; Gal. i. 18; ii. 8.

[2] Acts iii. 1–11; viii. 14; Gal. ii. 9; comp. John xx. 2–8; xxi. 20–23.

Devoted to their waiting hope, those noble women, who created the world's faith [in a resurrection], were almost unknown among the men of authority in Jerusalem. When they died, some of the most significant traits of early Christian history went to the grave with them. The active agents in a great movement alone survive in the world's memory; those content to love in secret remain unknown, but surely they have chosen the better part.

This little group of simple folk, it is needless to say, had no speculative theology. Jesus had wisely held aloof from philosophic theory. He had but one dogma, — his own divine sonship and mission. The entire creed of the primitive Church can be summed up in one line: "Jesus is the Messiah, the Son of God." This creed rested on one peremptory argument, "Jesus is risen from the dead," of which fact the disciples professed themselves to be witnesses. In strictness, no one, not even the women of Galilee, claimed to have *seen the resurrection*.[1] But the absence of the body, with the apparitions that ensued, amounted in the believer's view to the same thing. The task specially imposed upon all alike was to attest the resurrection as a fact.[2] And it soon came to be the belief that Jesus had himself foretold the event. Various words were recalled, supposed to have been misunderstood, which were after-

[1] In Matt. xxviii. 1–4, the guard at the sepulchre would appear to have witnessed the descent of the angel who drew away the stone. This very perplexed account would imply, but does not say, that the women also witnessed it. Neither, according to the narrative, saw the rising Jesus, but only the angel. This unsupported and inconsistent account is clearly the latest of all.

[2] Luke xxiv. 48; Acts i. 22; ii. 32; iii. 15; iv. 33; v. 32; x. 41; xiii. 30, 31.

wards seen to be a prophecy of it.[1] There was universal belief in his speedy glorious return. The watchword among the disciples, by which they were to know and strengthen one another, was *Maran atha*, a Syro-Chaldaic phrase, meaning "the Lord cometh" (1 Cor. xvi. 22). A saying of Jesus was thought to be recalled, a promise that his message should not have been declared in all the cities of Israel before the reappearance of the Son of Man in his kingdom (Matt. x. 23). Meanwhile he is risen and seated at the right hand of his Father. Here he rests until the solemn day when he will come, seated on the clouds, to judge the living and the dead. (Acts ii. 33, 34; x. 42.)

Their idea of Jesus was that given them by himself, — "that he was a prophet mighty in deed and word" (Luke xxiv. 19), a man chosen by God, who received a special message for humanity (Acts ii. 22), which he proved by his miracles, and above all by his resurrection. God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and endowed him with power; he spent his life in doing good and in healing those under the power of Satan (the author of every malady), for God was with him (Acts x. 38). He is the Son of God; that is, a man perfectly divine, representing God upon the earth; he is the Messiah, the deliverer of Israel, foretold by the prophets.[2] Reading from the Old Testament, especially the Prophets and the Psalms, was a constant practice with them. The ancient books, they thought, were full of him; thus in the reading they had one fixed idea, which was to find everywhere the type of Jesus. From the very first, there was made a collection of texts,

[1] See note, page 1, above.

[2] Acts ii. 36; viii. 37; ix. 22; xvii. 3, 4.

taken from the Prophets, Psalms, and some apocryphal books, in which, as they were convinced, the life of Jesus was foretold and portrayed.[1] This arbitrary style of interpretation was that of all the Jewish schools. The messianic allusions were a sort of play of wit, like the use which old-school preachers used to make of Bible texts, wholly turned from the natural meaning, and treated as mere ornaments of sacred rhetoric.

Jesus, with his healthy sense in religious matters, had founded no new ritual. The new sect had no distinguishing ceremonial (Jas. i. 26, 27). Its pious practices were those of other Jews. Its meetings had nothing properly liturgical; they were sessions of a brotherhood, given to prayer or the "speaking with tongues," to interpreting of prophecy,[2] and reading of correspondence. There is no priest (*cohen*, or ἱερεύς); the presbyter is simply the "elder" of the company. The only priest is Jesus;[3] in another sense, all the faithful are priests.[4] Fasting was held to be a practice of high merit;[5] baptism was the sign of admission to the body,[6] — the rite being that of John, administered in the name of Jesus.[7] Still, it was held to be an imperfect initiation, and should be followed by conferring gifts of the Spirit (Acts viii. 16; x. 47); which was done by means of a prayer by the apostles, with laying of hands on the candidate's head.

[1] Acts ii. 14; iii. 12; iv. 8, 25; vii. 2; x. 43; with the so-called epistle of Barnabas.

[2] These exercises are called "ministering to the Lord" (λειτουργεῖν) in Acts xiii. 2.

[3] Heb. v. 6; vi. 20; viii. 4; x. 11.

[4] Rev. i. 6; v. 10; xx. 6.

[5] Acts xiii. 2; Luke ii. 37.

[6] Rom. vi. 4–6.

[7] Acts viii. 12, 16; x. 48.

The laying on of hands, already so familiar to Jesus,[1] was the especially sacramental act.[2] It was held to confer inspiration, inner light, the power of working wonders, of prophesying, and of speaking with tongues. It was called the baptism of the Spirit, according to the saying of Jesus, "John baptised you with water, but you shall be baptised with the Spirit."[3] In course of time these several ideas were combined, and baptism was bestowed "in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost" (Matt. xxviii. 19). But this formula was not, probably, used in the early days of which we speak. The simplicity of the primitive Christian ritual is apparent, constructed as it was neither by Jesus nor by his apostles. Certain Jewish sects before them had adopted these grave and solemn ceremonies, which seem to have come in part from Chaldæa, where they are still practised, with special rites, by the Sabæans or Mendaites.[4] Many such rites are associated with the religion of Persia.[5]

The popular beliefs as to medical treatment, which aided the work of Jesus, remained with the disciples. The "gift of healing" was one of the marvellous powers conferred by the Spirit.[6] Like most Jews of their time, the primitive Christians regarded disease

[1] Matt. ix. 18; xix. 13, 15; Mark v. 23; vi. 5; vii. 32; viii. 23, 25; x. 16; Luke iv. 50; xiii. 13.

[2] Acts vi. 6; viii. 17–19; ix. 12, 17; xiii. 3; xiv. 6; xxviii. 8; 1 Tim. iv. 14; v. 22; 2 Tim. i. 6; Heb. vi. 2; Jas. v. 13.

[3] Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 26; Acts i. 5; xi. 16, xix. 4.

[4] Cholasté (Sabæan MSS.), 8, 10, 11, 13.

[5] Vendidad-Sadé, viii. 296; ix. 1–145; vi. 18, 19; Spiegel, *Avesta*, ii. 83.

[6] 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28, 30.

as the punishment of sin,[1] or else the act of harmful spirits (dæmons).[2] The apostles, like Jesus, were looked on as potent exorcists (Acts v. 16; xix. 12–18). It was believed that anointing with oil done by them, with laying-on of hands and calling upon the name of Jesus, were all-powerful to remove the sin that had caused the malady, and to heal the patient.[3] Oil has always been the remedy chiefly relied on in the East (Luke x. 34). The mere laying-on of the apostles' hands was thought to have the like effect.[4] This was done by direct touch. In some cases, it is possible that the warmth of the hands, when briskly applied to the head, brought some slight relief to the sufferer.

As the sect was yet new and small in numbers, questions regarding death did not come up till later. The effect caused by the first deaths among the brethren was singular.[5] Great solicitude was felt for the fate of the departed; the question arose whether they were less favoured than those who were kept alive to behold with their own eyes the advent of the Son of Man. The interval between death and resurrection came to be regarded as a sort of void in the consciousness of the deceased.[6] The idea conveyed in Plato's *Phædo* — that the soul exists before [birth] and after death, and that death is a gain, even a peculiarly philosophic state,

[1] Matt. ix. 2; Mark ii. 5; John v. 14; ix. 2; Jas. v. 15; Mishna, *Shabbath*, ii. 6; Bab. Talm. *Nedarim*, 41 *a*.

[2] Matt. ix. 33; xii. 22; Mark ix. 16, 24; Luke xi. 14; Acts xix. 12; Tert. *Apol.* 22; *Adv. Marc.* iv. 8.

[3] Jas. v. 14, 15; Mark vi. 13.

[4] Mark xvi. 18; Acts xxviii. 8.

[5] 1 Thess. iv. 13–18; 1 Cor. xv. 12–22.

[6] Phil. i. 23, seems to express a different view; but see 1 Thess. iv. 14–17; Rev. xx. 4–6.

since the soul is then ransomed and free [from the ills of mortality] — was not at all defined among the early Christians. It would seem that, in general, man in their view did not exist without a body. This view was long held, and did not give way until the doctrine of immortality in the Greek philosophic sense had been adopted in the Church, and associated, for better or worse, with the Christian dogma of a resurrection and universal renewal [of life].[1] Burial rites were no doubt performed in the Jewish manner; but no importance was attached to them, and no inscription recorded the name of the deceased. The general resurrection was at hand; the body would have but a short repose in its rocky bed. The question was not much mooted whether the resurrection would be strictly universal, of the good and bad together, or whether the elect alone would be raised.[2]

One of the most striking things in the new religion was the revival of prophecy. For a long time such a thing had hardly been spoken of as the existence of prophets in Israel. This particular form of inspiration seemed to spring up anew in the little sect. The primitive Church had many prophets and prophetesses,[3] like those in the Old Testament. Psalmists also reappeared. The model of Christian hymns is probably shown by

[1] Paul, as above and in Phil. iii. 11; Rev. chap. xx.; Papias (Euseb. iii. 39). A different view is indicated in Luke xvi. 22–31 [Dives in the place of torment] and xxiii. 43–46 [the thief on the cross]. But these are insufficient evidence as to the Jewish theology. The Essenes had already adopted the Greek view of the soul's essential immortality.

[2] Acts xxiv. 15; 1 Thess. iv. 13–17; Phil. iii. 11; comp. Rev. xx. 5. See Leblant, *Inscr. chrét. de la Gaule*, ii. 81 *et seq.*

[3] Acts xi. 27–30; xiii. 1; xv. 32; xxi. 9, 10, 11; 1 Cor. xii. 28–30; xiv. 29–37; Eph. iii. 5; iv. 11; Rev. i. 3; xvi. 6; xviii. 20, 24; xxii. 9.

the examples given in the first two chapters of Luke, which are moulded upon the Old Testament canticles. In form, these hymns and prophecies offer nothing new, but they are marked by a fine sweetness of spirit, and by a living and penetrating piety — as it were, a softened echo of the later products of the sacred lyre of Israel. The Book of Psalms may be called the chalice of the flower whence the Christian bee sipped its first draught of honey. On the other hand, the Pentateuch would seem to have been little read or studied; in place of it we find allegories of the type of the Jewish *midrashim*, discarding all historic sense.

The singing that accompanied the new psalmody[1] was probably that monotone of ejaculation, without distinct notes, which we still find among the Greeks and Maronites, and in the oriental churches generally,—the identity of method in separate religious communities testifying to its antiquity. It is not so much a musical modulation as a way of forcing the voice and uttering a sort of nasal moan, diversified by the rapid sequence of various inflections. This strange musical utterance is delivered standing, with fixed gaze, wrinkled forehead, knitted brow, and apparent effort. The word "Amen," in particular, is spoken with a quavering voice, as if in a shiver. This word is very conspicuous in the Eastern liturgies. Like the Jews,[2] the new believers employed it to mark the assent of the crowd to the word of the prophet or precentor.[3] Some secret efficacy may have been already ascribed to it, and it was spoken

[1] Acts xvi. 25; 1 Cor. xiv. 15; Col. iii. 16; Eph. v. 19; Jas. v. 13.

[2] Num. v. 22; Deut. xxvii. 15; Ps. cvi. 48; 1 Chr. xvi. 36; Neh. v. 13; viii. 6.

[3] 1 Cor. xvi. 16; Justin, *Apol.* i. 65, 67.

with a certain emphasis. Was this earliest ecclesiastical chant accompanied by instruments? We do not know. The passage which speaks of "pipes or harps" (1 Cor. xiv. 7), or the verb "to touch" the string (ψάλλειν, rendered "sing," *id.* 15), is not decisive. That inward song called "singing in the heart" (Eph. v. 19; Col. iii. 16), which was but the overflow of these tender, ardent, and dreamy souls, was doubtless uttered in a low murmur, like the songs of the Lollards of the Middle Age.[1] In general, such hymns were the outpouring of joy; thus we find the exhortation of James (v. 13), "Is any among you afflicted? let him pray. Is any merry? let him sing" (ψαλλέτω).

This first Christian literature was intended purely for the edification of the assembled brethren, and was not written. The idea of composing books had as yet occurred to no one. Jesus had spoken: his disciples gathered up and treasured his words. Had he not promised that the generation of those who heard him would not have passed away before he should reappear?[2]

[1] Du Cange s. v. *Lollardi* [Century Dictionary, *Lollards*]; comp. songs of the Cevennes: *Avertissemens proph. d'Elie Marion* (Lond. 1707), 10, 12, 14.

[2] Matt. xv. 28; xxiv. 34; Mark viii. 39; xiii. 30; Luke ix. 27; xxi. 32.

CHAPTER VI.

JEWISH CONVERTS AND PROSELYTES. — A. D. 36.

Hitherto the Church at Jerusalem has appeared as a little Galilæan colony. The friends of Jesus dwelling at or near Jerusalem — Lazarus, Martha and Mary of Bethany, Joseph of Arimathæa, Nicodemus — had disappeared from the scene. The Galilæan group alone, gathered close about the Twelve, remain united and active. These disciples were continually zealous in the propagation of the gospel. Later, after the destruction of Jerusalem, and at a distance from Judæa, the discourses of the apostles were represented as public scenes, taking place in open squares, in the presence of crowds. Such an idea must probably be put among the conventional images in which legend abounds. The authorities that had put Jesus to death would never have allowed such scenes of disturbance to be renewed. The faith was spread mostly through the influence of conversations, which "daily in the Temple and in every house" (Acts v. 42) communicated the sacred warmth from soul to soul. Preachings in Solomon's Porch would be addressed to little groups, but would have all the deeper effect. They consisted chiefly of citations from the Old Testament, intended to prove that Jesus was the Messiah, as we see by the examples in the early chapters of Acts (as ii. 29–36). The reasoning was thin-spun and weak, but this was like all the Jewish

expositions of that date: it was quite as good as that which the rabbis of the Mishna drew from Bible texts.

Still weaker was the evidence of asserted prodigies alleged to sustain these arguments. We cannot doubt that the apostles really believed that they wrought miracles, which would pass as the proofs of their divine mission.[1] Paul himself, by far the ripest intelligence of the first Christian school, believed that he wrought them.[2] It was regarded as certain that Jesus had done the same. The series of such divine manifestations would naturally continue. Thaumaturgy (wonder-working) is, in fact, a special prerogative of the apostles until the end of the first century (Acts v. 12–16): the Book of Acts is full of miracles, and the revival of Eutychus (xx. 7–12) was doubtless told by an eye-witness.[3] These miracles are of the same sort with those of Jesus, and consisted chiefly, but not exclusively, of the healing of sickness and exorcism of the possessed. Both Jewish and Christian exorcism were regarded, even by pagans, as genuine.[4] It is related (Acts v. 15) that the mere shadow of Peter was efficacious for miraculous cures. These prodigies were held to be the regular gifts of the Holy Spirit, like the gift of knowledge, preaching, or prophecy.[5] In the third century, the Church still held itself to possess the same endowment, and, as a sort of permanent right, to exert the power of healing the sick, driving out demons, and

[1] 1 Cor. i. 22; ii. 4, 5; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 5; 2 Thess. ii. 9; Gal. iii. 5; Rom. xv. 18, 19.

[2] Rom. xv. 19; 2 Cor. xii. 12; 1 Thess. i. 5.

[3] See also chap. xxviii., and Papias in Euseb., iii. 39.

[4] See Damascius, *Life of Isidore*, 56.

[5] 1 Cor. xii. 9, 28; also *Apostol. Constit.* viii. 1.

predicting the future.[1] Ignorance made anything of the sort credible. Even in our own day, we see worthy people, lacking in scientific knowledge, continually deceived by chimeras of magnetism and the like; while to the Mormons miracles are an every-day matter — every one works them.[2]

We should not judge of the means of conversion in the early Church by these natural errors, or by the feeble discourses of the Book of Acts. The true proclamation of the word was in the private conversations of these excellent and fully convinced men; it was in the echo of the words of Jesus, still audible in their discourses; it was, above all, in the sweetness of their piety. The attraction of the communal life they led was also a source of much strength. Their home was like an asylum, where all the poor and forsaken might find shelter and help.

One of the first who united with the infant community was a man of Cyprus named Joseph *Hallevi* (the Levite). This man, like the others, sold his field and brought the price to lay it at the feet of the Twelve. He was a man of intelligence, proof against every trial, and ready of speech. The apostles won his close attachment, and called him *Bar naba*, that is, "the son of prophecy," or "of exhortation" (Acts iv. 36, 37; xv. 32). He was reckoned, indeed, among the prophets (xiii. 1), that is, inspired preachers. Hereafter we shall find him playing an important part; and, after Paul himself, he was the most active missionary of the first

[1] Iren. *Adv. hær.* ii. 23:4; v. 6:1; Tert. *Apol.* 23, 43; *Ad Scap.* 2; *De corona*, 11; *De spect.* 24; *De anima*, 57; *Const. Apost.* viii. 1, taken apparently from the *Charismata* of Hippolytus.

[2] Jules Remy, *Voy. au pays des Mormons*, i. 140, 192, 259, 260; ii. 53.

century. One Mnason, his fellow-countryman, was converted at the same time with him (xxi. 16). Cyprus had many Jewish colonies;[1] both Barnabas and Mnason were of Jewish blood, as we see in the case of Barnabas from his name "Levite," while Mnason seems to be the translation of some Hebrew name having the root *zacar*, perhaps Zachariah. The close and long-continued relations of Barnabas with the church at Jerusalem incline us to think that he was familiar with the Syro-Chaldaic tongue.

An acquisition almost as important as that of Barnabas was that of a certain John, who had the Roman surname of Mark (*Marcus*), a cousin of Barnabas, "of the circumcision" (Col. iv. 11). His mother, Mary, was in easy circumstances, a convert like her son, occupying a house which was more than once a place of meeting for the apostles.[2] These two conversions seem to have

[1] Jos. *Antiq.* xiii. 10 : 4; xvii. 12 : 1, 2; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 26.

[2] Among the places of their private gathering (see Acts xii. 12) was the house of one Mary, the mother of Mark. This young disciple was then, as we may imagine him, an eager and intelligent boy, considerably under twenty, — most probably, the "young man" who, catching the enthusiasm of the triumphal entrance from Bethany, had hovered near the disciples down to the arrest of Jesus, when the pursuers caught him by his linen garment, and he "fled from them naked," as he tells the tale himself (Mark xiv. 52). We take good heed of this young man, thus visibly brought before us, who will prove an important actor in many a scene of the history that follows. Listening eagerly to the incidents and memories reported there, — impressed especially (as we find from many a hint in the later narrative) by the vigorous personality of Peter and the sober force of character in the elder James, — it is not long before he begins to put together, in a plain, artless, and irregular fashion of his own, the fragments of a connected account of that wondrous Ministry; and so, within six or eight years of the events related, we find already composed the original sketch of what, in the course of two later recensions, became our present "Gospel according to Mark." See *Unitarian Review*, September, 1891, p. 226, notice of *Das Urevangelium*, etc. (Ernst Solger, Jena, 1890, pp. 129.) — Ed.

been the work of Peter;[1] at least he was on terms of intimacy with both mother and son, and was at home in their house.[2] Even if this John Mark was not the writer of the Second Gospel, he filled an important place; since the name Mark, not being common among the Jews, probably refers to him wherever it occurs. We shall meet him later, as the companion of Paul, Barnabas, and probably Peter, in their apostolic journeys.

Thus the flame of the new faith spread fast. Men of chief mark in the apostolic period were almost all won over in the first two or three years, as it were by a common impulse. It was a second Christian generation, appearing side by side with that which had gathered, five or six years before, about the Lake of Tiberias. These younger disciples had not seen Jesus, and could not rank with the former in authority, — surpassing them, however, in activity and missionary zeal. One of the best known among them was Stephen, who before his conversion seems to have been, not a Jew, but a simple proselyte (Acts vi. 5; viii. 2), a man full of heat and passion. His faith was most ardent, and he was believed to be endowed with all spiritual gifts. Philip, who, like Stephen, was a deacon and a zealous evangelist, joined the community at the same time with him, and is often confounded with the apostle of that name (Acts xxi. 8, 9). At this time, too, were converted Andronicus and Junia (or Junias, Rom. xvi. 7), — most likely husband and wife, who, like Aquila and Priscilla at a later date, made a model apostolic pair, devoted to missionary cares. They were of Is-

[1] 1 Pet. v. 13; Papias in Eusebius, iii. 39.

[2] Acts xii. 12–14. The whole chapter, so closely connected with Peter, seems to have been composed by John Mark, or from his information.

raelite blood, and closely related to the apostles (συγγενεῖς), — Jews at all events, whether Benjamites from Tarsus, or really of Paul's kindred (Rom. ix. 3; xi. 14).

The new accessions were all, at the time of their conversion, Jews, but of two widely differing classes. A part were "Hebrews," [1] that is, Palestinian Jews, speaking Hebrew, or rather Aramaic, and reading the Scripture in Hebrew; the rest "Hellenists," that is, Jews speaking Greek and reading the Scripture in Greek. Hellenists, again, were of two classes, some being of Jewish blood, and others "proselytes," that is, not Israelites by birth, but in various degrees affiliated with Jews. Most of them were from Syria, Asia Minor, Egypt, or Cyrene (Acts ii. 9–11; vi. 9), and dwelt in distinct quarters at Jerusalem, having their separate synagogues, and making little communities apart. Of such separate synagogues there were very many; the Jerusalem Talmud (*Megilla*, 73 *d*) puts them at four hundred and eighty, which number will not seem incredible to those who have seen the little family mosques so frequent in Mussulman towns. It was in such communities as these that the word of Jesus found the "good and fertile ground" for its propagation and bearing of fruit.

The nucleus of the Church had at first consisted wholly of "Hebrews," the Aramaic dialect, that spoken by Jesus, being the only one known or used. But we see that, within a year or two after the death of Jesus, the Greek tongue was already creeping into the little community, where it was destined soon to dominate. By reason of their daily relation with the new converts,

[1] Acts vi. 1, 5; 2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5.

Peter, John, James, and Jude, in short, the Galilæans generally, learned Greek the more readily, as they probably knew something of it before. The diversity of language led to some division in the community, in which the two parties were not quite harmonious, as we shall soon find evidence (Acts vi. 1). After the destruction of Jerusalem (A. D. 70) we see the "Hebrews," withdrawn beyond the Jordan, to the upland near the lake of Tiberias, forming a Church apart, with a history of its own.[1] But, previous to that time, it does not appear that the diversity of tongues had any serious consequence in the Church. Orientals are quick to learn a new language; two or three dialects are spoken in most Eastern towns. The Galilæan apostles who were active in the field would soon gain a practical knowledge of Greek — the epistle of James, for example, is in quite pure Greek; and when the foreign converts became the more numerous, would use it in preference to their native Aramaic. The Palestinian dialect had to be abandoned, as soon as a widely extended propaganda was designed. A provincial idiom, written with difficulty,[2] and never spoken outside of Syria, would be as far as possible from serving the purpose. Greek, on the other hand, was in a manner compelled upon Christianity. It was the universal language of the time, at least for the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean; and was the language of the Jews scattered through the Roman empire. Then, as now, the Jews adopted with the utmost facility the language

[1] See "Antichrist" (in this series), pp. 241–243.

[2] Scholars wrote in the old Hebrew, a little altered. Passages like some found in the Babylonian Talmud (*Kiddushin*, 66 *a*) may have been composed about the time of which we speak.

of the country where they lived. They made no point of purity in speech; that is why early Christianity used such bad Greek, for even the most learned Jews were ill speakers of the classic tongue, as Josephus remarks at the close of his "Antiquities." Their form of expression was always patterned upon the Syriac, and they were never quite free from the influence of the rude dialects brought among them by the Macedonian conquest, as is proved by transcriptions from Greek into Syriac. Syrian inscriptions are in very corrupt Greek.[1]

Conversions of "Hellenists" soon became far more numerous than those of "Hebrews." The old Jews of Jerusalem were little drawn toward a sect of provincials, imperfectly trained in the study of the Law, the only science that a Pharisee could understand. The little church held, as Jesus had held before, a dubious attitude in regard to Judaism. But every religious or political party has within itself a force which dominates it, and compels it, however reluctantly, to traverse its own orbit. The first Christians, whatever their seeming respect for Judaism, were in reality Jews only by birth or by outward observance. The spirit of the sect was from another source. The true product of official Judaism was the Talmud; but with the Talmudic school Christianity had no affinity whatsoever. Hence Christianity found favour chiefly in the least Jewish parties among the Jews. Those rigidly orthodox would give it no ear. Those who listened to the apostles and their followers were the new comers, those hardly catechised, who had attended no great school, who were out

[1] This point is further developed by the author in his *Éclaircissements* (Paris, 1849).

of the beaten track, and unlearned in the holy tongue. Looked down upon by the aristocracy of Jerusalem, these new comers into Judaism thus retaliated against their scorners. A young party, just established in a community, and least inured to its traditions, is always most inclined to innovation.

Among those least enslaved to the doctors of the Law, credulity was also, it would appear, most child-like and complete. That credulous Jew, delighting in the marvellous, whom the Roman satirists seem to have known, is not the Jew of Jerusalem; he is the Hellenistic Jew, at once very devout and little learned, and in consequence extremely superstitious. Neither the half-sceptic Sadducee nor the over-strict Pharisee would be much affected by the "wonders" so much in vogue in the apostolic circle. But right there, eager for belief, was the "Judæus Apella," whom the epicurean Horace mocks at (Sat. i. 5: 105). Furthermore, social questions particularly interested those who did not profit by the wealth that flowed into Jerusalem, drawn by the Temple and the central institutions of the Jewish nation. And, by allying itself with cravings like those which we now call "socialistic," the new sect laid the solid foundation on which the structure of its future was to be built.

CHAPTER VII.

CHARITABLE ACTS AND INSTITUTIONS. — A. D. 36.

A GENERAL fact is brought to our attention in the comparative history of religions. All those which have had a beginning, which are not coeval with the birth of language itself, have been built up by means of social rather than theological demands. It was certainly so with Buddhism. What gave its prodigious currency to this religion was not the nihilistic philosophy that lay at its base, but rather its fitness to a social need. By proclaiming the abolition of caste, by establishing (to use his own words) "one law of grace for all," Sakya-Muni and his followers drew after them, first, India, then the largest part of Asia: so Burnouf has shown in the Introduction to his collected and translated texts. Like Christianity, Buddhism was a movement among the poor. The wondrous charm that drew all to fall in with it was the facility it offered to the dispossessed classes to recover their position by the profession of a faith which lifted them up and opened to them the unlimited resources of pity and help.

The number of the poor in Judæa, in the first century of our era, was very great. The country is by nature devoid of resources which procure wealth. In countries such as this, without industry, almost all great fortunes have their origin either in richly endowed religious institutions, or in government favour. The

wealth of the Temple had long been the exclusive possession of a small number of nobles. The Asmonæan kings, descendants of the Maccabees, had gathered about themselves a group of wealthy families, and the Herods greatly increased luxury and prosperity in a certain social class; but the true theocratic Jew, turning his back to the Roman civilisation, had grown all the poorer. There had grown up a considerable religious class, — pious, fanatical, strict observers of the Law, and outwardly in extreme poverty. This class made the recruiting-ground for the various fanatical sects and parties, which were so numerous at this time. The universal dream was a reign of the Jew of the lower orders, and the humbling of the rich, who were regarded as renegades, traitors, who had gone over to profane life and foreign manners. There was never such hatred among men as that felt by these "God's poor" against the splendid structures that began to cover the country, and against the works of the Romans.[1] To avoid starvation they were forced to toil on these structures, which seemed to them monuments of unlawful, godless pride and luxury; and so thought themselves victims of wealthy profligates, corrupt at heart, and forsakers of the Law.

By such a class as this we may conceive how eagerly an association of mutual help was welcomed. The little Christian Church must seem to them a paradise. This household of simple-hearted and closely united brethren drew together adherents from all sides. In return for what he might contribute, each obtained a degree of security against the future, the kindliest of fellowships, and inestimable hopes. The usual practice

[1] See chapter xi. of the "Life of Jesus."

was to turn one's property into money[1] before joining the community. This property commonly consisted of little country holdings, not very profitable, and troublesome to manage. It was a clear advantage, especially for those unmarried, to exchange such bits of land for an investment in a society for mutual insurance, in anticipation of the Divine Kingdom. Some few married persons joined even in advance of such a settlement of their goods, and precautions were taken that these members should really bring in all their property, and keep nothing back from the common fund (Acts v. 1–11). In fact, since each received in proportion not to his investments but his needs (*id.* ii. 45, iv. 35), any such keeping back was regarded as a robbery of the community. We see the surprising likeness between these attempts at organising the poorer classes and certain utopian schemes of our own day. There is, however, a wide difference in this, — that the Christian communism had a religious base, while modern socialism has not. It is plain that, where the dividend is in the ratio of the investor's need and not of his investment, an association can rely only on a very exalted spirit of self-sacrifice, an ardent faith, and a religious motive.

In such a social constitution the difficulties of administration must be very numerous, whatever the spirit of fraternity may be. Especially where there are two sections or parties speaking different tongues, misunderstandings cannot be avoided. Jews by race were almost sure to look down, more or less, upon their less high-born co-religionists. In fact, murmurings soon began to be heard. The "Hellenists," increasing in

[1] Acts ii. 45; iv. 34, 37; v. 1.

numbers every day, complained that their widows were unfairly treated in the distribution of supplies (v. 1). Hitherto the apostles had superintended the division. But, in the face of such complaints, they felt the need of delegating this part of their authority. They proposed, accordingly, to intrust the charge of administration to seven men of prudence and good repute. The proposal was accepted, an election was had, and the following were chosen: Stephen, Philip, Prochorus, Nicanor, Timon, Parmenas, and Nicolas. The last was from Antioch, a simple proselyte; so was probably Stephen, as we have seen. Quite the opposite of what was done in electing Matthias as an apostle, when the choice was solely among the primitive disciples, all those now chosen were not only new converts, but Hellenists, as their purely Greek names denote. Stephen was the most conspicuous among them, and stood in a sense at their head. All were presented to the apostles, who set them apart by a formal rite, with prayer and the laying of hands upon their heads.

The name given to the new administrators was the Syriac *Shammashîn*, in Greek Διάκονοι (*attendants*), which we render "deacons." They were sometimes called "the Seven," in distinction from "the Twelve." Such was the origin of the diaconate, which is thus shown to be the oldest of ecclesiastical offices, or sacred orders. All the churches thereafter organised had "deacons," in imitation of that at Jerusalem. The institution of the new order was marvellously fertile in results. It raised the care of the poor at once to the level of a religious service; it laid down the maxim that social questions are the first of all to be consid-

ered; it laid the foundation of political economy in the domain of religion. The deacons were the best of Christian preachers. We shall soon see in what rank they were held as evangelists; as organisers, economists, administrators, their post was more important still. These practical men, in perpetual touch with the poor and sick, and with women, went everywhere, saw everything, exhorted and converted in the most effective way.[1] They were far more efficient messengers of the faith than the apostles, who kept quietly at Jerusalem in their place of honour; and were the real creators of what was most solid and durable in Christianity.

Women were very early admitted to this service,[2] having, as among us, the name of sisters.[3] At first they were widows, as we see by the letter to Timothy; but afterwards unmarried women ("virgins") were preferred for the office.[4] In all this the early Church showed an admirable tact. The foundations of charity, the specially Christian virtue, were laid by these excellent and simple hearted men with a science which was deep because it came from the soul. They had before them no existing model. The pious structure built up by the toil of these two or three first years was a vast ministry of beneficence and mutual help, to which both sexes brought each its special faculty, combining their efforts for the relief of human misery. These were the most fruitful years of all Christian history. The still

[1] Phil. i. 1; 1 Tim. iii. 8–13.

[2] Rom. xvi. 1, 12; 1 Tim. iii. 11; v. 9–16; Pliny, *Epist.* x. 97. The Epistles to Timothy were probably not written by Paul, but are at any rate very old.

[3] Rom. xvi. 1; 1 Cor. ix. 5; Philem. 2.

[4] *Constit. Apost.* vi. 17.

living thought of Jesus is seen to pervade his disciples, and to direct them with wonderful clearness and precision in their work. To him, in truth, should be given the glory of that which his apostles effected on a larger scale. He, as will appear, laid in his lifetime the groundwork of those constructions which so fruitfully and speedily, after his death, attained their full development.

Naturally, women thronged to a community in which the weak found so effective aid. Their social position was at this time humble and precarious.[1] Widows, especially, in spite of some legal protection, were little regarded and were generally left in misery. Many teachers held that women should receive no religious education.[2] The Talmud puts the virgin who wastes her time in prayer under the same reproach with the spying and gossiping widow who spends her days in scandal-mongering among her neighbours.[3] The new religion provided an honourable and safe refuge for these poor forsaken creatures (Acts vi. 1). Some women held a position of high respect in the Church, and their houses served as places of assembling (*id.* xii. 12). Those who had not houses of their own were made into a sort of order by themselves, a presbytery of women,[4] probably including the unmarried, which filled an important place in the organising of charitable work. Institutions commonly regarded as the late fruit of Christianity — female congregations, beguines, and sis-

[1] Wisd. ii. 10; Ecclus. xxxvii. 17; Matt. xxiii. 14; Mark xii. 40; Luke xx. 47; Jas. i. 27.

[2] Mishna, *Sota*, iii. 4.

[3] Babyl. Talm. *Sota*, 22 *a*; comp. 1 Tim. v. 13; Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. etc.*, under the words צליבית and שובבית.

[4] 1 Tim. v. 9–16; Acts ix. 39, 41.

ters of charity — were really among its earliest creations, the first-fruits of its vigour, and the most perfect expressions of its spirit. In particular, the admirable scheme of consecrating by a sort of religious character, and submitting to a regular discipline, those women who are not bound by the duties and relations of wedlock, is altogether Christian. The word "widow" came to denote a religious person devoted to divine things, and in consequence a "deaconess." (1 Tim. v. 3.) In these regions where a wife of four-and-twenty is already faded, — when there is for the woman but one step from childhood into old age — a new life, as it were, was created for that half of humanity most susceptible of devout impressions.

The age of the Seleucidæ (B. C. 300–180) had been a terrible period of feminine extravagances. The world had never seen so many scenes of domestic discord, such a series of adulteresses and female poisoners. Wise men of that time were led to think of women as a scourge of the human race, an element of baseness and shame, an evil power, whose only task it was to contend against the germs of a nobler life in man.[1] Christianity changed all this. At an age which in our eye is still youth, but in which the life of the oriental woman is so sombre, so fatally given over to the suggestions of evil, the widow, wrapping her head in a black mantle,[2] might become a person held in honour, with a worthy calling, a deaconess, the equal of the most respected men. Christianity thus exalted and sanctified that hard posi-

[1] Eccl. vii. 27; Ecclus. vii. 26; ix. 1 *et seq.*; xxv. 22; xxvi. 1; xlii. 9.

[2] The type of the woman devoted to a religious life is in the East a widow, in the Western Church a virgin. For their costume, see Greek MS. 64, fol. 11 (*Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris).

tion of the childless widow.[1] She stood on almost the same level with the virgin; she became the "fair matron" (καλογρία),[2] venerated, serviceable, honoured as a mother. These women, constantly going and coming, were admirable missionaries for the new faith. It is an error of Protestants to judge these matters from our modern individualistic point of view. When we have to do with Christian history, the primitive element is socialism or communism.

At this day there was no bishop, no priest, such as time has developed since. But the pastoral office, the intimate concourse of souls outside the lines of kindred, was already established. This has always been the special gift of Jesus, and is, as it were, a heritage from him. He had often said that to each who believed in him he was more than father or mother; that the dearest must be forsaken to follow him. Christianity set something above the family; it created the bond of spiritual fraternity, spiritual marriage. Marriage in antiquity, putting the wife in her husband's power without restraint, without counterpoise, made her his slave. The moral freedom of woman began when the Church gave a confidant, a guide in Jesus, to direct and console, to listen to her at all times, and sometimes encourage her self-assertion. Woman [as well as man] needs control of some authority, and is unhappy without it; but it is needful that she should love the one who exercises it. This is what neither antiquity nor Judaism nor Islam could effect. To this day, it is in Christianity alone that woman has found a religious

[1] See the "Shepherd" of Hermas, vis. 2, ch. 4.

[2] This is the name given to a woman of religious vocation in the Eastern Church.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

consciousness, a moral individuality, or an opinion of her own. Thanks to bishops and the monastic life, a Queen Radegond could find means to escape the tyranny of a barbaric consort. Since the life of the soul is all that counts, it is right and reasonable [according to the Catholic ideal] that the pastor, who can make the divine chord thrill to his touch — the private counsellor, who holds the key to the conscience — should be more than father, more than husband.

Christianity was, in one view, a reaction against the too rigid constitution of the Family in the Aryan race. Not only the old Aryan societies hardly admitted any but married men into the body politic, but they interpreted marriage in its strictest sense. It was some thing akin to the English family [as we find it sometimes represented], — a close, stifling, narrow circle, an egotism of the household, almost as desiccating to the soul as the solitary selfishness of one. Christianity, with its divine thought of the "liberty of the sons of God," checked this exaggeration. First, it avoided the enforcing upon everybody the burdens of the masculine commonwealth. It recognised that the family is not the sole type of social life, — at least, not a type to be stamped upon all alike; that the care of progeny is not a charge laid upon every man; that from such charge (a sacred charge, no doubt) it is well that a special class should be relieved. Greek society made such an exemption in favour of women like Aspasia (ἑταῖραι, "feminine companions"); and Italian society did the same for the *cortigiana* ("court-lady"), like Imperia: this was done in consideration of the demands of polite society. A similar exemption was made by Christianity, in view of the common good, for the priest, the person devoted to

a religious life, the deaconess. Thus various social conditions were adopted in the infant Church. There are souls so constituted as to choose before the love of five or six persons, the love of several hundreds; and to these family life, under its ordinary conditions, seems insufficient, cold, and tiresome. Why force upon all persons the requirements of our dull and narrow family life? The secular family alone is not enough; it is needful that there be brothers and sisters "not of the flesh."

These opposite demands seem for a time to have been reconciled in the primitive Church by its hierarchy of different social obligations. We shall never fully understand what happiness there was under these pious regulations, which sustained freedom without enforcing it, and made possible at once the calm enjoyments of the community with those of private life. Such freedom was widely apart from the confusions of our artificial and loveless condition of society, in which the feeling soul is often shut out into cruel solitude. In these modest retreats which we call churches the atmosphere was warm and gentle. Within them life was spent in the same faith and hope. Such conditions, however, plainly could not apply to society at large. When a whole nation has turned Christian, the primitive order becomes an utopia, and takes refuge in the monastery. In this view, monastic life is but the continuation of that in the early Church. The convent is the necessary deduction from the Christian theory of life; the convent, or its equivalent, is needed to carry out completely the Christian ideal, since it is the only complete realising of the gospel rule. Thus, even in Protestant America, we find congregations of pietists,

which, like the Catholic convent, revive many a feature of the primitive Christianity.[1]

Much in these beneficent constructions is no doubt due to Judaism. Each of the Jewish communities scattered along the Mediterranean coast was already a sort of church, with its fund for mutual relief. Almsgiving, as incessantly urged by the wise men of old,[2] had become a sort of common law; it was practised in both temple and synagogue,[3] and was made the first duty of the proselyte (Acts x. 2, 4, 31). In all ages Judaism has been distinguished by the care of its poor and by the sentiment of brotherly charity it fosters.

It would be the height of injustice to extol Christianity at the expense of Judaism, from which most of its primitive features were derived. It is when we look at the Roman world that we find the real contrast, in those miracles of charity and free association effected by the Church. No secular society, assuming reason only for its base, has wrought these admirable results. The law of every secular, philosophic society (if I may call it so) is *liberty*, sometimes *equality*, seldom or never *fraternity*. As a matter merely of justice, charity lays no claim; it regards only the individual; it is found to be in some ways even harmful [as by the encouragement it gives to beggary], and so excites distrust. Every attempt to maintain the poor at public cost savours of communism. When a man starves to death,

[1] L. Bridel, *Récits Américains:* Lausanne, 1861. [Our newest forms of philanthropy have reproduced some of these features in the "college settlement."]

[2] Prov. iii. 27; x. 2; xi. 4; xxii. 9; xxviii. 27; Ecclus. iii. 23; vii. 36; xii. 1; xviii. 14; xx. 13; xxxi. 11 (with the context); Tobit, ii. 15, 22; iv. 11; xii. 9; xiv. 11; Dan. iv. 24; Jerus. Talm. *Peah*, 15 *b*.

[3] Matt. vi. 2; Mishna, *Shek.* v. 6; Jerus. Talm. *Demai*, 23 *b*.

when whole classes waste in wretchedness, political economy only finds that public misery is a public burden. It proves, to its own satisfaction, that civil and political order rests on individual freedom, of which the consequence is that one who has nothing and can earn nothing must starve. This is good logic; but against the abuse of logic there is no defence. The needs of the "most numerous and most wretched class" at length carry the day. Institutions merely political and civil are not enough. Social and religious aspirations have also their rightful claim.

The glory of the Jewish people is to have proclaimed this principle in tones of thunder, — a principle which made the ruin of ancient States, but which will never be uprooted. The Jewish Law is social, not political. The prophets and writers of apocalyptic visions have promoted social, not political, revolutions. In the first half of the first century, the Jews had but one idea. This was to repudiate the advantages of Roman Justice, — that philosophic and atheistic justice, impartial to all; and to declare the excellence of their theocratic Law, the foundation of a religious and moral State. The object of Law is human happiness: this is the idea of all Jewish thinkers, like Philo and Josephus. The laws of other nations insist that justice shall have its course; little it recks whether or not to make men good and happy. The Jewish Law stoops to the last details of moral training. Christianity only carries farther out the same idea. Each church is a monastery, where each has the rights of all; where there must be neither poor nor wicked; where every man, consequently, must watch himself and govern himself. The primitive Church may be defined as a great community

of poor men, an heroic effort to control human selfishness, founded on the maxim that each has the right only to what he needs, while the overplus belongs of right to those who have none. We see at once that between this spirit and that of Rome there must ensue a mortal conflict; and that Christianity will succeed in ruling the world only on condition of a profound alteration in its native tendencies and its original plan.

Yet the needs which it represents will never cease to exist. Beginning with the second half of the Middle Age [after the death of Saint Bernard in 1153, which closed the first great era of monasticism], communistic life had served the abuses of an intolerant Church; the monastery had come to be too often a feudal fief or the barracks of a dangerous and fanatical soldiery [as in the horrid religious war of Languedoc]. The modern spirit, in consequence, has shown itself bitterly hostile to monasticism in all its forms. We have forgotten that it is in communistic life the soul of man has tasted the deepest joy. The glad song is no longer ours: "How good and how pleasant it is when brothers live together in unity!" But, when modern individualism shall have borne its latest fruit; when mankind, belittled, saddened, impotent, shall take refuge again in noble institutions and vigorous discipline; when the heroes and idealists of humanity shall have driven out with a scourge of thongs our mean "society of shopkeepers," our modern world of pygmies, — then the great word "commonwealth" will find again its meaning. A multitude of grand interests, like science, no longer dependent on hereditary wealth, will be organized under the monastic form. Family importance, which our age has set so high, will

be shrunken. Selfishness as the bottom law of civilised society will not content the noble soul. All such, thronging from every side, will join in alliance against vulgar greed. The words of Jesus, the thoughts of the Middle Age, regarding poverty, will come back to us. We shall understand how possession may once have been held a disadvantage; how the early mystics, professors of the "poverty of Christ," disputed for ages whether Jesus himself owned anything of those "goods which perish in the using." Such Franciscan subtilties will again make grave social problems. The splendid ideal sketched by the writer of "Acts" will again be written as a prophetic revelation, on the gateway of the world's paradise: "The multitude of them that believed were of one heart and of one soul; neither said any of them that aught which he possessed was his own, but they had all things common. Neither was there any in need among them; for as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them, and brought the price of the things sold and laid it at the apostles' feet, and distribution was made to every man according as he had need" (iv. 32–35). "And they broke their bread daily from house to house, and did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart" (ii. 46).

But let us not anticipate. We are now at or about the year 36. Tiberius, at Capreæ, has no suspicious dread of that foe to the Empire, who is now increasing in strength. Within two or three years the Church had grown surprisingly, now reckoning several thousands of disciples (Acts ii. 41). One might easily foresee that its conquests were to be mainly from among the Hellenists and proselytes. The Galilæan group who had listened to the Master, while retaining their pri-

macy, were well-nigh lost in the flood of new comers whose native tongue was Greek. We already feel that the future belongs to these men. Hitherto no Gentile, — that is, none without some previous relations with Judaism — has come into the Church. But proselytes, as we have seen, already hold important charges in it. The circle from which the converts have been drawn is greatly widened. We see no longer a simple small group of Palestinians, but reckon among them men from Cyprus, Antioch, and Cyrene, — in general from almost every point on the eastward shores of the Mediterranean where Jewish colonies were established. Thus far, and for a long time yet to come, Egypt makes no contribution to the primitive Church. The Jews of Egypt were almost at open feud with those of Palestine. They lived their own life, in many ways more prospered, and were very little touched by any impression from the religious movements at Jerusalem.

CHAPTER VIII.

FIRST PERSECUTION AND THE DEATH OF STEPHEN — A. D. 37.

The discourses of the new sect, with whatever of reserve they might be spoken, could not fail to awaken the angry hostilities that had gathered about the Founder and had caused his death. The Sadducæan family of Hanan, by whose direct influence he had been condemned, was still in power. Joseph Caiaphas continued to hold, in 36, the high-priesthood, though the real exercise of power lay with his father-in-law Hanan and his kinsmen John and Alexander.[1] These arrogant and hard-hearted men looked with an evil eye upon a company of worthy and pious people, who without official dignity could win the favour of the multitude.[2] Once or twice, Peter, John, and the chief members of the body of apostles, were put in prison and condemned to scourging, the penalty inflicted upon heretics,[3] not requiring the consent of Roman authorities. As we may well believe, these cruelties only quickened the zeal of the apostles. They left the Sanhedrin, where they had undergone the scourging, full of joy at having been judged worthy to suffer ignominy for his sake whom they loved (v. 41). It is but a childish thing to

[1] Acts iv. 6; see "Life of Jesus," p. 348.
[2] Acts iv. 1–31; v. 17–41.
[3] See "Life of Jesus," p. 177.

attempt the suppression by penalties of things of the spirit. These officials, no doubt, passed as guardians of the peace, as models of sagacity and prudence, — these dullards who, in the year 36, thought to settle the doom of Christianity with a few strokes of the lash!

These attacks came chiefly from the Sadducees,[1] that is, from the higher ranks of the priesthood, those who surrounded the Temple and derived large profit from it.[2] The Pharisees do not appear to have shown the animosity against the new sect which they exhibited against Jesus. The Christian believers were strictly pious people, in their way of life very like the Pharisees themselves, whose wrath against Jesus arose from jealousy at his too manifest superiority to them. His keen retorts, his clear understanding and personal charm, his undisguised contempt of false pretenders to piety, had kindled in them a bitter hate. The apostles, on the other hand, were rather dull of wit, and void of all touch of his fine irony. To these the Pharisees at times showed marks of favour; some of them even became Christian converts (Acts xv. 5, xxi. 20). The terrible rebukes of Jesus were not yet written down, and the tradition of his words was neither general nor uniform. We may suppose, besides, that the mutual ill-will of Jesus and the Pharisees was exaggerated by the Synoptics on account of the circumstances which, in the time of the great war, led to the retreat of the Christians across the Jordan. It is clear, meanwhile, that James "the Lord's brother," was almost a Pharisee himself.[3]

[1] Acts iv. 5, 6; v. 17; Jas. ii. 6.
[2] Comp. Acts iv. 6 with Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8:8.
[3] See "Antichrist," chap. iii.

These first Christians were, further, harmless people, so void of offence that many of the Jewish aristocracy, while not belonging to them, were well inclined to favour them. Nicodemus and Joseph of Arimathæa, who had known Jesus personally, continued in friendly relations with the Church. Rabbi Gamaliel, the elder, the most famous Jewish doctor of the day, grandson of Hillel, a man of broad views and very tolerant, advocated in the Sanhedrim, it is said, the liberty of gospel preaching.[1] The writer of Acts credits him with an excellent declaration of opinion, which might well serve as a rule of policy to governments whenever confronted by innovations in the intellectual or moral order: "If," said he, "this counsel or this work be of men, it will perish of itself; but if it is of God, you cannot destroy it. Would you, then, be found fighting against God?" Gamaliel's words found little hearing. Between opposite fanaticisms, a really liberal and enlightened policy has small chance of success.

A terrible outburst was called out by the deacon Stephen (Acts vi. 8–vii. 59). His preaching, it appears, was gaining a wide influence. Crowds thronged about him, and such assemblies were sure to lead to lively disputes. They were largely made up of Hellenists or proselytes, habitual attendants on what was called the "synagogue of Freedmen" (*Libertini*), probably descendants of Jews who had been taken to Rome as slaves, and afterwards manumitted,[2] men from Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia, or Ephesus, greatly addicted to these disputes. Stephen passionately maintained that Jesus was the true Messiah, that the priests had been guilty of a

[1] Acts v. 34–39; "Life of Jesus," p. 240.

[2] See Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 23; Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 85.

crime in his death, that the Jews were rebels, of a rebellious stock, who shut their eyes to evidence. The authorities resolved to destroy this daring preacher. Witnesses were deputed to lie in wait for some word against Moses in his discourse, and naturally found what they wanted. Stephen was put under arrest, and brought before the Sanhedrim. The phrase charged against him was almost exactly the same that had brought about the condemnation of Jesus. He was accused of saying that Jesus of Nazareth would destroy the Temple and change the traditions ascribed to Moses (Mark xiv. 58). It is quite possible that Stephen may have used some such language. A Christian of that time would not dream of speaking in so many words against the Law, which all Christians then obeyed; while Stephen may well have opposed the traditions, as Jesus did himself, — these very traditions being ignorantly traced to Moses by the orthodox, who assigned to them a value equal to that of the written Law.[1]

Stephen, in his defence, set forth at great length passages from the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets, closing with a vehement charge against the members of the Sanhedrim, as guilty of the murder of Jesus." "Stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart!" said he, "will you still continue to resist the Holy Spirit, as your fathers did? Which of the prophets did they not persecute? They put to death every one who foretold the coming of the Just One, whom you have betrayed, and whose murderers you are! That very Law which you received from the mouth of angels, you yourselves have

[1] Matt. xv. 2–9; Mark vii. 3; Gal. i. 14.

not kept!"[1] At these words Stephen was interrupted by a yell of wrath; but rising to a still higher pitch, he fell into one of those fits of frenzy which were called inspirations of the Holy Spirit. Fixing his gaze upward, he "saw the glory of God and Jesus enthroned on the right hand of his Father," and cried aloud, "I see the heavens open and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God!" The bystanders stopped their ears, and threw themselves upon him gnashing their teeth, dragged him out of the city, and stoned him to death. The witnesses, who according to the Law (Deut. xvii. 7) were bound to cast the first stones, threw off their garments and laid them at the feet of a young fanatic named Saul, or Paul, who reflected (no doubt) with secret satisfaction on the merit that he was earning by his share in the death of a blasphemer.[2]

Throughout this shocking scene the directions given in the thirteenth chapter of Deuteronomy were scrupulously observed. But by the Civil Code this tumultuary execution, carried out without consent of the Roman authorities, was illegal (John xviii. 31). In the case of Jesus, as we have before seen, the ratification of the Governor (*procurator*) was required. It may be that this ratification was obtained for the execution of Stephen, and that it was not the sudden act of a mob, as would appear from the narrative in "Acts." The Roman authority too, may have slackened its rule in Judæa. Pilate had been deposed from his

[1] Comp. Gal. iii. 19; Heb. ii. 2; Jos. *Antiq.* xv. 5:3. The common view was that God himself did not appear in person in the theophanies of the Old Testament, but sent in his stead an intermediary, "the messenger of Jehovah," *maleak Jahveh* (מלאך יהוה).

[2] Acts vii. 59; xxii. 20; xxvi. 10.

office, or was just about to be. The real cause of his disgrace was the too great severity of his administration.[1] Jewish fanaticism had made life unendurable to him. He was perhaps weary of refusing to these lawless leaders the violences they insisted on his conniving at; and the haughty house of Hanan had no longer need of his permission to execute a death sentence. Lucius Vitellius (father of him who was emperor a generation later) was then Imperial Legate (Governor-General) of Syria. He aimed at gaining the good-will of the native populations, and restored to the Jews the priestly vestments which had been kept in the tower Antonia since the time of Herod.[2] Far from upholding Pilate in his acts of severity, he yielded to the popular complaints, and despatched him to Rome, early in the year 36, to answer the charges of maladministration. The chief grievance of his subjects was that he did not sufficiently indulge their intolerant temper, as was shown at the trial of Jesus.[3] Vitellius put in his place, for the time, his own friend Marcellus, who was doubtless more indulgent to the Jews, and consequently more ready to wink at their religious murders. The death of Tiberius, on the 16th of March, A. D. 37, further encouraged Vitellius in his lax policy. The first two years of Caligula were a time of general relaxation to the Roman authority in Syria. The policy of Caligula, until he lost his wits, was to restore a certain local independence to the East and its native rulers. Thus he established the kingdoms, or principalities, of

[1] Josephus, *Antiq.* xviii. 4:2.

[2] *Ibid.* xv. 11:4; xviii. 4:2; xx. 1:1, 2.

[3] Compare his conduct then with that of Festus, related in Acts xxiv. 27; xxv. 9.

Antiochus in Commagene, of Herod Agrippa, Soheym, Cotys, and Polemon II.; and allowed that of Hâreth (Aretas) at Damascus to increase.[1] When Pilate arrived in Rome (A. D. 37), he found the new reign already begun. Caligula probably decided against him, for he gave the charge of Jerusalem to a new official, Marullus, who seems not to have stirred up among the Jews such violent opposition as overwhelmed the unlucky Pilate, and brought his rule to grief. The same had befallen Ventidius Cumanus; Josephus, it is true, exaggerates the ill-fortune of all who had opposed his nation.

The thing here to be remarked, meanwhile, is that at this period the persecutors of the Christians were not the Romans, but the orthodox Jews. The Romans, amid all fanaticism and intolerance, maintained a rational toleration. If any charge is to be made against the imperial authority, it is that of acting weakly, and not cutting short at once the breaches of civil order caused by a bloody code which punished religious offences with death. But the Roman dominion had not yet the complete sovereignty which it afterwards came to have; it was a sort of protectorate, or suzerainty. Concession was carried so far as not to offend Jewish pride by putting the emperor's head on coins struck under the procurators.[2] Rome did not as yet attempt — certainly not in the East — to impose her own laws, deities, and customs upon the conquered peoples, but left to them their local usages undisturbed by the Roman code. This half-way independence was

[1] Suetonius *Caius*, 16; Dion Cassius, lix. 8, 12; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5:3; 6:10; 2 Cor. xi. 32.

[2] Madden, *Hist. of Jewish Coinage*, 134.

a sufficient mark of their subjection. The imperial power in the East was like the Turkish rule of the present day, and the condition of the native populations was like that of its Christian subjects. The idea of equal rights and equal guaranties for all did not exist. Each provincial group had its special jurisdiction, much as the Jews and the several Christian churches have under the Ottoman empire. In Turkey, a few years ago, the several Patriarchs — Greek, Armenian, Syrian — slight as were their relations with the Porte, were sovereign over their subordinates, and might pronounce the cruellest penalties against them.

The death of Stephen may have been in either of the years 36, 37, or 38, and we do not know what responsibility Caiaphas may have had in it. He was deposed by Vitellius in 36, a little while after Pilate ;[1] but this made little change. He was succeeded by his brother-in-law Jonathan, son of Hanan ; and he, in his turn, was succeeded by his brother Theophilus,[2] continuing the high-priesthood in the house of Hanan till 42. Hanan was himself still living, and, as the real holder of the power, maintained those qualities of pride, hardness, and hatred of innovation, which were hereditary in that house.

The death of Stephen made a deep impression. The proselytes accompanied his burial with tears and groans.[3] The separation between Jew and Christian was not yet complete. Proselytes and Hellenists, less strictly orthodox than full-blooded Jews, thought it a duty to render public honours to a man who did honour to their

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4 : 3. [2] *Ibid.* 5 : 3.

[3] Acts viii. 2. The term "devout" (εὐλαβεῖς) denotes a proselyte : cf. ii. 5.

class; and whose personal beliefs had not put him out of the law.

Thus opens the era of the Christian Martyrs. Martyrdom was not, itself, quite a new thing. Not to speak of John the Baptist and Jesus, Judaism had had its witnesses, faithful unto death, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But the succession of noble victims that began with Saint Stephen has had a very special influence in the history of human thought. It introduced into the Western world an element hitherto lacking in it, — exclusive and absolute faith; the idea that there is one only good and true religion. In this sense, the era of martyrdom introduced the era of intolerance. We may say, without being far from the truth, that one who gives his life for his faith would be intolerant if he were master. Christianity, which had undergone three centuries of persecution, when it came to dominion in its turn, was the most persecuting of all religions. When one has shed his own blood for a cause, he is too ready to shed others' blood to keep the treasure which he has won.

And besides, the cruel death of Stephen was not a solitary case. A real persecution was let loose upon the Church by the Jews, now trusting in the weakness of Roman officials.[1] These troubles seem to have borne most heavily on the Hellenists and proselytes, whose freedom of procedure angered the orthodox. The Church at Jerusalem, compact as it was, was forced to scatter. The apostles did not quit the capital, following a practice which they seem to have firmly decided

[1] Acts viii. 1–3; xi. 19; xxvi. 10. This last would imply that there were other deaths than that of Stephen, but the passage is rhetorical. Cf. ix. 1, 2, with xxii. 5, and xxvi. 12.

on.[1] It is also probable that the purely Jewish group, the so-called "Hebrews," remained with them.[2] But the larger Christian community, with its repasts in common, its charitable service of deacons, and its varied exercises, is at an end from this time forth, and was never reconstructed on the former model. It had now lasted two or three years. And, for Christianity still in its cradle, it was an unexampled good fortune that its first communistic attempts at organisation were thus broken short off. Attempts of this sort lead to abuses so shocking that all communistic forms of association are doomed to be short-lived, — as was the case with the Essenes, — or very soon to fall away from the principles of their foundation, as happened to the Franciscan Order. Thanks to this persecution of A. D. 37, the monastery-church at Jerusalem was spared the test of time. It fell apart in the flower of its days, before it had been honeycombed by its home difficulties. It survived only as a splendid dream, whose memory enlivened in their season of trial those who had had part in it; as an ideal, to which Christianity will evermore aspire without attaining (1 Thess. ii. 14).[3] Great lives most often have their root in the experience of some few months during which they have felt the Divine presence, months whose fragrance is enough to fill whole years with strength and sweetness.

In the persecution now referred to, the leading part

[1] Acts i. 4; viii. 1, 14; Gal. i. 17–20.

[2] Thus compare the expressions in Acts viii. 1 with those in ix. 26–30.

[3] Those who know what an inestimable treasure to the survivors of the St. Simonist church is the memory of Menilmontant, — what mutual affection it creates, and what joy glistens in their eyes when they speak of him, — will understand how strong a bond it is among brethren in a new faith, to have loved, and then suffered, together.

was taken by that young man Saul, who has been seen as an accomplice (so far as in him lay) in the death of Stephen. This maniac,[1] armed with a permit by the priests, entered houses thought to harbour Christians, laid violent hands upon men and women, and dragged them to prison or before the courts.[2] It was his boast that no man of his time had been as zealous as he for the traditions.[3] Often, indeed, he was astonished at the sweetness and resignation of his victims, and felt for them a pity bordering on remorse, fancying himself to hear those pious women, whom he had cast into prison for their hope of the divine kingdom, saying to him softly by night, "Why dost thou persecute us?" The blood of Stephen, which had nearly stained his own garments, would at times trouble his sight. Many things which he had heard of Jesus went to his heart. He was, as it were, haunted by the phantom of that more than man, dwelling in the heavenly life, from which he would descend in vision from time to time. But such thoughts Saul would put from him with horror, with frenzied effort confirming himself in the faith of his tradition, and scheming fresh cruelties against those who assailed that faith. His name became a word of terror to the disciples. From him they dreaded the most awful deeds of violence, and the bloodiest acts of perfidy.[4]

[1] So he speaks of himself (ἐμμαινόμενος), in Acts xxvi. 11.

[2] Acts viii. 3; ix. 13, 14, 21, 26; xxii. 4, 19; xxvi. 9–11; Gal. i. 13, 23; 1 Cor. xv. 9; Phil. iii. 6; 1 Tim. i. 45.

[3] Gal. i. 14; Acts xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5.

[4] Acts ix. 13, 21, 26.

CHAPTER IX.

FIRST MISSIONS; PHILIP THE DEACON. — A. D. 38.

The persecution of A. D. 37 brought about, as such acts always do, an extension of the doctrine which it sought to check. Till now, the proclamation of Christianity had scarce been heard beyond the walls of Jerusalem. No mission had been set on foot; the mother church, shut up in her lofty but narrow communism, had shed no ray outward, and had formed no centres of enlargement for its work. The dispersion of this little group of the upper chamber scattered the good seed to the four winds of heaven. Members of the church at Jerusalem, forced by violence from their retreat, spread through all parts of Judæa and Samaria,[1] everywhere preaching the kingdom of God. The deacons, in particular, lightened of their administrative charge by the ruin of their community, became admirable propagators of the gospel. They were the youthful and active element of the body, as distinct from the somewhat weightier and slower portion made up of the apostles and the "Hebrews." In the work of preaching, their language alone put these latter at a disadvantage. Their ordinary speech, if not their only speech, was a dialect which the Jews themselves hardly made use of at a few leagues' distance from Jerusalem. The

[1] Acts viii. 1; xi. 19.

Hellenists reaped all the honour of the grand achievement which it will now be my purpose to relate.

The scene of the first of those missions which were soon to cover all the circuit of the Mediterranean was the region close to Jerusalem, within a circle of two or three days' travel. The deacon Philip[1] was the chief actor in this first pious expedition. He taught the word in Samaria with great success. The Samaritans were schismatics; but the new sect, like its Master, was less scrupulous on points of orthodoxy than the stricter Jews. Jesus had on several occasions shown himself friendly to Samaritans.[2]

Philip seems to have been one of those most engaged in the working of wonders in the apostolic circle (Acts viii. 5–40). The conversions he made among the Samaritans, especially at Sebaste, their capital, are explained by miracle. The region itself was full of superstitious notions about magic. Some two years before the coming of the Christian preachers (A. D. 36) a fanatic had stirred up serious emotion among the Samaritans by insisting on the need of returning to primitive Mosaism, asserting that he had discovered

[1] Acts viii. 5–13. This was not Philip the apostle: see viii. 1, 5, 12, 14, 40; xxi. 8. It is true that, comparing Acts xxi. 9 (which speaks of Philip's four daughters), with what is said by Papias and Polycrates (Euseb. iii. 39; v. 24), and by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iii. 6), the apostle is made to appear the same with him who plays so important a part in Acts. But that verse is to be taken as an interpolation and a misunderstanding, rather than contradict the tradition of the churches in Asia, and especially Hierapolis [see "Antichrist," pp. 273–276]. The Fourth Gospel (written, probably, in Asia Minor) indicates sources of information respecting the apostle Philip, which would thus be easily explained.

[2] "Life of Jesus," chap. xiv. But it may be that the writer here indicates a disposition of his own: see Introd. (above), 12, 24, and pp. 154, 187 (below).

the original sacred implements.[1] One Simon, from Gitton or Gitta,[2] who afterwards attained high repute, began about that time to be known by his so-called magic acts.[3] It is a pity to find a preparation and a support for the gospel teaching in such chimeras. Many were baptised in the name of Jesus. Philip was competent for baptism, but not for conferring the gifts of the Spirit, which lay exclusively with the apostles. When the forming of a company of disciples at Sebaste became known at Jerusalem, it was resolved to send Peter and John to complete their initiation. They came, laid their hands upon the heads of the new converts, with prayers; and these were at once endowed with the marvellous powers appertaining to the bestowal of the Spirit, — miracles, prophecy, and all the phenomena of illuminism. In this regard, then, the church at Sebaste was noway inferior to that in Jerusalem.

If we may believe the tradition, Simon of Gitton was at this time in near relation with the Christians, having been converted by Philip's miracles, baptised, and attached to this evangelist. Then, on the arrival of Peter and John, he witnessed the marvellous powers conferred by the imposition of hands; and, it is said,

[1] *Jos. Ant.* xviii. 1, 2.

[2] Now *Jit*, on the road from Naplous to Jaffa (Robinson, iii. 134).

[3] All we know of this Simon, from Christian sources, is so mixed with fable that some have doubted his existence, — the more, since in the later pseudo-Clementine writings the name is a pseudonym of Paul. But this is not the only basis of the legend. How should the writer of Acts, so friendly to Paul, admit a story so open to a hostile construction? The later story of the Simonian school, its writings still extant, and the precise indications of time and locality given by Justin, a fellow-countryman (*Apol.* ii. 15; *Tryph.* 120), are not easily acounted for on the theory that the whole account is fable.

came to them with the offer of money in case he too might receive the gift of bestowing such powers as these. To which they made the admirable reply, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou thoughtest that the gift of God might be purchased with money! Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right with God!" (Acts viii. 9–24.)

Whether these words were really spoken or not, they seem to express the true relation of Simon toward the growing sect. We shall see, indeed, that he was the leader of a religious movement parallel with that of Christianity, which may be regarded as a sort of Samaritan counterfeit of the work of Jesus. Had Simon already begun his dogmatising and wonder-working when Philip first came into Samaria? Had he any real connection with the Christian Church? Is there any truth in the story which makes him the father of all "Simony"? Are we to believe that the world once saw face to face two wonder-workers, one of them a charlatan and the other the "Rock" which was the corner stone of the faith of mankind? Could a sorcerer thus hold in the balance the destinies of Christianity? All this we know not, for lack of documentary evidence; the Book of Acts is here of weak authority, and even in the first century Simon was already a legendary person to the Christian Church. In history, the general thought alone may be safely trusted. It would be wrong to stop short with the shock we may feel at this wretched page of the Christian annals. For rude hearers the miracle proves the doctrine; on our part, the doctrine may persuade us to forget the miracle. When a belief has comforted and bettered mankind, it may be pardoned for having made

use of proofs adapted to the weak understanding of the people it addressed. But what pardon can be allowed to error as the proof of error? We are not here pronouncing condemnation upon Simon of Gitton. We shall hereafter attempt to explain his doctrine and his place in history, which were not made clear until the reign of Claudius.[1] We have here had only to remark that an important principle seems through him to have been brought to bear upon the so-called Christian miracles. Forced to admit that impostors also wrought miracles, orthodox theology ascribed these miracles to evil spirits. Then, in order to preserve some value as proofs to miracles as such, rules must be made to distinguish the true from the false. And for this, a descent must be made to a level of mere puerility.[2]

Having thus strengthened the church at Sebaste, Peter and John returned to Jerusalem, preaching on the way among the villages of Samaria. The deacon Philip extended his missionary journey toward the south in the old territory of the Philistines (Acts viii. 26–40). This region, since the time of the Maccabees, had been much divided up among the Jews, who did not, however, gain complete control.[3] On the way, Philip wrought a conversion which was widely spoken of on account of a special circumstance. One day, as he was proceeding along the rarely travelled road that runs from Jerusalem to Gaza,[4] he met a rich wayfarer, evidently a stranger, since he was riding in a vehicle, a

[1] Justin, *Apol.* i. 26, 56.

[2] See the Clementine Homilies, xvii. 15, 17; Quadratus in Euseb. iv. 3.

[3] 1 Macc. x. 86, 89; xi. 60; Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 19: 3; xv. 7: 3; xviii. 11: 5; *War*, i. 4: 2.

[4] Robinson, ii. 41, 514, 515 (2d ed.).

thing then almost unknown among the inhabitants of Syria and Palestine. He was returning from Jerusalem, and, sitting at his ease, was reading aloud from the Hebrew scriptures, after a common custom of the time.[1] Philip, who thought himself under divine guidance in every act, felt himself drawn to accost the traveller. Walking by his side, he civilly entered into conversation with this richly dressed personage, offering to explain the texts which he found too difficult. To the evangelist this was a happy occasion to set forth the Christian interpretation of the Old Testament figures of speech. Thus he showed how everything in the prophetic books referred to Jesus; that Jesus was the key to the enigma, and of him especially the Seer had spoken in the tender passage: "He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb is dumb before its shearer, he opened not his mouth" (Isa. liii. 7). The traveller accepted this exposition; and at the first spring they found, "See, here is water," said he; "is there anything to prevent my being baptised?" The chariot was stayed; Philip went down into the water with the stranger, who was at once baptised.

Now this traveller was a man of consequence, a eunuch (chamberlain) of the Princess (*Candace*) of Ethiopia, her minister of finance and keeper of her treasury, who had gone up to worship at Jerusalem, and was on his return to Napata[2] by way of Egypt. Candace (or *candaoce*) was at this period the feminine title of royalty in Ethiopia.[3] Judaism had then penetrated into

[1] Bab. Talm., *Erubin*, 34 *a*, 53 *b*; *Sota*, 46 *b*.

[2] Now *Merawi*, near Gebel-Barkal: Lepsius, *Denkmäler*; Strabo, xvii. 1: 54.

[3] Strabo, xvii. 1: 54; Pliny, vi. 35: 8; Dion Cassius, liv. 5; Euseb. ii. 1.

Nubia and Abyssinia, where many of the natives had been converted,[1] or at least were reckoned among the proselytes who, without circumcision, worshipped the One God.[2] The eunuch was perhaps of this latter class, — a candid pious pagan, like the centurion Cornelius, who appears in this history at a little later date. We cannot, at all events, suppose him fully initiated in Judaism;[3] and, after this incident, he is not further heard of. But Philip related the occurrence, which was afterwards regarded as important. When the admission of pagans to the Christian Church came to be debated, this proved a weighty precedent, since Philip was regarded as having acted throughout by divine guidance (Acts viii. 26, 29). Baptism conferred, by direct command of the Holy Spirit, upon a man hardly even a Jew and notoriously uncircumcised, a convert of a few hours at most, had great dogmatic value as an argument for those who thought that the doors of the new Church should be open to all.[4]

After this occurrence Philip proceeded to Azotus (or Ashdod). In the childlike enthusiasm common among these missionaries, they were ready at every step to listen to a voice from heaven, or to take instructions

[1] Descendants of these Jewish converts (not of Israelite blood) are still found, under the name *Falâsyân*. They were converted by missionaries from Egypt, and their version of the Bible was made from the Greek.

[2] John xii. 20; Acts x. 2.

[3] See Deut. xxiii. 1. The word "eunuch" may, it is true, be taken to designate a chamberlain or court-functionary; but should be here understood in its literal sense.

[4] It would be rash to infer that the story was fabricated by the writer of Acts. He, it is true, gladly puts in relief the facts which sustain his own opinion, but cannot be fairly charged with inserting as fact what was purely symbolic or imaginary (see Introd. pp. 38, 39).

from the Spirit.[1] Every step seemed to them to be directed by a higher power, and they thought themselves to obey a superhuman guidance when they went from one village to another. Sometimes they fancied that they were wafted through the air; thus Philip — one of the most exalted, who thought he had been led by an angel to the spot where he met the eunuch — was persuaded that he had been "caught up" by the Spirit, and transported in a flash to Azotus.[2]

This was the southern limit of the first preaching of the gospel. Beyond this were the desert and the nomadic life, upon which Christianity has never had much hold. From Azotus Philip turned northward, evangelising all the coast as far as Cæsarea. It may be that the churches of Joppa and Lydda, which we soon find quite flourishing (ix. 32, 38), were founded by him. He remained at Cæsarea, where he founded an important church (viii. 40, xi. 11), and where we find him twenty years later (xxi. 8). This was a new city, and the most important in Judæa.[3] It had been built on the site of a Sidonian fortress, called "tower of Abdastarte or Strato," by Herod the Great, who, in honour of Augustus, gave it the name which its ruins still bear. It was far the best port in all Palestine, and was fast tending to become the real capital. The procurators of Judæa, weary of staying in Jerusalem, were soon to make Cæsarea their customary residence.[4] Its population was chiefly made up of pagans;[5] and

[1] So among the Mormons (see Remy) and missionaries of other faiths [as is constantly illustrated among the early colonists of New England].

[2] Acts viii. 39, 40; comp. Luke iv. 14.

[3] Jos. *War*, iii. 9 : 1.

[4] Acts xxiii. 23; xxv. 1, 5; Tacitus, *Hist.* ii. 79.

[5] Jos. *War*, iii. 9 : 1.

savage quarrels often broke out between the different classes.[1] Greek was the only language commonly spoken, and even the Jews had learned to recite some portions of their liturgy in Greek.[2] The austere rabbis of Jerusalem regarded it as an abode ungodly and dangerous, where one became almost a pagan.[3] For the various reasons just given, Cæsarea will be a place of much consequence in the sequel of this history. It became the especial Christian port, through which the church at Jerusalem communicated with the Greek and Roman world.

Many other missions, unknown to our history, were conducted on the same lines with that of Philip (Acts xi. 19). This first Christian preaching won success by the very rapidity of its course. In 38, five years after the death of Jesus, one year after that of Stephen, all Palestine this side the Jordan had heard the good news from the lips of missionaries sent forth from Jerusalem. Galilee preserved its own sacred seed, which it probably spread beyond its borders, though we know no missions of its sending. Possibly Damascus, in which Christians were already found (ix. 2, 10, 19), may have received the faith from Galilæan preachers.

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8: 7; *War*, ii. 13: 5–14: 5; 18: 4.
[2] Jerus. Talm. *Sota*, 21 *b*.
[3] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 7: 3, 4; 8: 2.

CHAPTER X.

THE CONVERSION OF PAUL. — A. D. 38.

BUT quite another conquest was won to the Church in the succeeding year (38).[1] We may with all probability place in this year the conversion of that Saul whom we have seen as an accomplice in the stoning of Stephen, and as chief actor in the persecution of 37; who, by a mysterious stroke of grace, will be hereafter found the most ardent among the disciples of Jesus.

Saul was born at Tarsus in Cilicia,[2] in the tenth or twelfth year of our era; for, in the epistle to Philemon (ver. 9), written about A. D. 61, he speaks of himself as "aged" (πρεσβύτης); while, referring to events in 37, he is called "a young man" (νεανίας, Acts vii. 57). Following the custom of the time, his name had been Latinised as "Paul": thus Jesus (Joshua) was often changed to Jason, Joseph to Hegesippus, and Eliakim to Alkimus;[3] but by this name he was not usually called until he became known as the apostle to the Gentiles, after which it becomes constant, and is so given in the subscription to all his epistles. He was of the

[1] The date may be inferred by comparing Acts ix., xi., xii. with Galatians i. 18, ii. 1, especially by observing the coincidence of events in Acts chap. xii. with those of secular history, fixing their date at A. D. 44.

[2] Acts ix. 11, xxi. 39, xxii. 3.

[3] Jerome (*De vir. ill.*) supposes that Paul took the Latin name of Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus (Acts xiii. 9), his first illustrious convert. But this explanation seems unwarrantable.

purest Jewish blood, Ebionite calumnies (recorded by Epiphanius) to the contrary notwithstanding. His family was perhaps (as Jerome records) from the town of Gischala in Galilee, but claimed to belong to the tribe of Benjamin (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5). His father was registered as a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 28). Some one of his ancestors had probably purchased this title or had earned it by services: for example, his grandfather may have obtained it by aid given to Pompey in the Judæan conquest of B. C. 63. As with all the good old Jewish houses, his family belonged to the party of the Pharisees (Acts xxiii. 6). Paul was brought up in the strictest practices of this sect (Phil. iii. 5; Acts xxvi. 5); and, if he afterwards rejected its narrow dogmas, he always kept its ardent faith, its severe and exalted temper.

In the time of Augustus, Tarsus was a very flourishing city. The population belonged chiefly to the Greek or Syrian (Aramæan) race; but, as in all towns of commercial consequence, Jews were very numerous. Learning and science were here a favourite pursuit. No other city in the world, Athens and Alexandria not excepted, was so rich in schools and scientific institutions;[1] and Tarsus was famed for the number of learned men trained in its schools.[2] But we need not infer from this that Paul had received a very careful education in Greek letters. Jews rarely frequented institutions of Gentile learning, and the most famous schools of Tarsus were those of rhetoric.[3] The first

[1] Strabo, xiv. 10: 13.

[2] *Ibid.* 10: 14, 15; Philostr. *Apollonius*, 7.

[3] Jos. *Antiq.* (closing paragraph); "Life of Jesus," pp. 101, 102; Philostr. *u. s.*

thing to be learned in these schools was the classic Greek. We cannot suppose that a man who had been taught even the element of grammar and rhetoric would have written in the uncouth, inaccurate style, void of all Greek finish, which we find in the epistles of Paul. He spoke Greek habitually and easily;[1] he wrote or rather dictated,[2] in that tongue; but his Greek was that of the hellenising Jews, a Greek laden with Hebrew and Syriac forms of speech, hardly intelligible to a Greek man of letters, which we can understand only by hunting up the Syriac phrase that Paul had in his mind when dictating. He himself admits (2 Cor. xi. 6) the rude and popular quality of his style. When he could, he spoke Hebrew, so-called; that is, the Syro-Chaldaic of his time (Acts xxi. 40).[3] That is the language in which he spoke, the language of the inward voice he heard on the road to Damascus (Acts xxvi. 14).

No more does his doctrine show any direct indebtedness to the Greek philosophy. His citation (1 Cor. xv. 33) of a verse from Menander's *Thais*[4] — "evil communications corrupt good manners" — is one of the one-line proverbs that are in everybody's mouth, and may easily be quoted without any knowledge of their source. Two other citations, — one from Epimenides (Tit. i. 12), that "the Cretans are always liars," and one from Aratus (Acts xvii. 28), that "we are also His offspring," — are not certainly his own: the epistle to Titus is of doubtful authorship; and the speech of Paul

[1] Acts xvii. 22-28; xxi. 37.

[2] Gal. vi. 11; Rom. xvi. 22.

[3] The term *ἑβραϊστί* is explained in my *Hist. des langues Sémit.*, ii. 1: 5; iii. 1: 2.

[4] See Meinecke, *Menandri fragmenta*, p. 75.

at Athens (so called) was more probably composed by the writer of "Acts," and the citation from Aratus (*Phœn.* 5) is also found in the well known hymn of Cleanthes, taken perhaps by both from some nameless religious composition. Paul's culture is almost wholly Jewish (Gal. i. 14); parallels are to be found rather in the Talmud than in the Greek classics. All that reached him were a few general ideas, taken from the philosophers into the common stock, which one might know without having opened a single book of Greek philosophy. Certainly, he knew nothing of the Aristotelian logic. His form of argument is noway indebted to that method, while, on the other hand, it is very like that in the Talmud. In his reasoning, Paul is governed more by words than thoughts; a word lodged in his mind controls him, and leads him into a line of thought far away from his main object. His transitions are abrupt, his line of thought is broken, and his sentence often remains unfinished. There was never a more unequal writer. In all literature it would be hard to find so strange a case as his, of a noble passage like the chapter on Charity (1 Cor. xiii.) side by side with weak reasoning, tedious repetitions, and hair-splitting casuistry.

His father early destined him to be a rabbi, but, as the custom was,[1] gave him first a trade. Paul was by occupation a "tent-maker" (σκηνοποιός, Acts xviii. 3), which we should perhaps understand as a carpet-weaver, or one who wrought in those coarse Cilician fabrics woven of goat's-hair, called *cilicia*.[2] This trade

[1] See "Life of Jesus," p. 130.

[2] These fabrics were weatherproof, and were used "for horse-cloths, tents, sacks, and bags to hold workmen's tools, and for the purpose of

he would exercise upon occasion,[1] as he inherited no fortune from his father. He had at least one sister, whose son lived in Jerusalem (Acts xxiii. 16). Certain vague and doubtful hints seem to show that a brother and other relations[2] of his accepted Christianity.

It would be thoroughly wrong to infer from our modern ways of thinking, which closely associates wealth and manners, that Paul, because he was a man of the people, was ill bred and without distinction. When he chose, he exhibited extreme courtesy and even refinement of manner. For all his lack of finish in style, his letters (especially that to Philemon) show a man of fine intelligence, his lofty tone of feeling being expressed with rare felicity of phrase. No correspondence ever showed finer traces of personal regard, a more delicate touch, a kindlier anxiety to avoid all occasion of offence. One or two of his pleasantries, it is true, offend us.[3] But what spirit, what a tone, what wealth of charming phrases! We feel that, unless an impetuous temper should for the moment make him irritable and harsh, his true disposition was that of a man courteous, affectionate, solicitous to please, sometimes thin-skinned, and a little jealous. Such men are at a disadvantage before the public eye; he hints (2 Cor. x. 10) that his adversaries found "his bodily presence weak and his speech contemptible." But, in the seclusion of their little congregations, the same men have vast advantages through the warm affection they inspire, their apt skill in mat-

covering military engines," etc. (Smith's *Dict. of Antiquities*). We should therefore call Paul a "hand-loom weaver" of the coarser fabrics. — Ed.

[1] Acts xviii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 12; 1 Thess. ii. 9; 2 Thess. iii. 8.

[2] 2 Cor. viii. 18, 22; xii. 18; Rom. xvi. 7, 11, 21 (see note, p. 108).

[3] Gal. v. 12; Phil. iii. 2 [sardonic jests on the practice of circumcision].

ters of practice, and their aptitude in finding their way out of the gravest difficulties.

Paul was of inferior personal presence, not corresponding (it appears) with the grandeur of his soul. He was homely in feature, short in stature, thickset, with stooping shoulders, a small bald head, oddly set on his sturdy frame, and a pale face taken possession of (as it were) by a thick beard, an aquiline nose, keen eyes, and black beetle-brows, meeting in the middle.[1] Nor was his manner of speech impressive;[2] something timid, hesitating, incorrect, gave an unfavourable first impression of his oratory; though, as a man of tact, he dwelt upon his own outer defects, and even made them an advantage.[3] The Jewish race is noticeable for giving us specimens at once of the noblest beauty and the completest ugliness; but this is an ugliness peculiarly its own. One of these extraordinary faces, which at first sight excites a smile, may lighten up, and then it displays a marvellous sombre glow and majesty.

Paul's temperament was no less singular than his person. His constitution, though evidently hardy, since it endured a life full of fatigue and suffering, was not sound. He makes frequent reference to his bodily frailty, showing himself as a man scant of breath, sickly, overstrained, timid, without dignity of aspect, with nothing to strike the eye favourably, such, in short, that it is a merit not to have stopped short, in

[1] *Acta Pauli et Theklæ*, 3, in Tischendorf, *Acta apost. apocr.*, p. 41 (an old text even if not that mentioned by Tertullian); *Philopatris* (A. D. 363), 12; Malala, *Chron.*, 237; Nicephorus, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 37. All these seem to rely on ancient portraits, and to be the more trustworthy that they insist, notwithstanding, on Paul's being a handsome man.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 1–5; 2 Cor. x. 1, 2, 10; xi. 6.

[3] 1 Cor. ii. 3; 2 Cor. i. 8, 9; x. 10; xi. 30; xii. 5, 9, 10; Gal. iv. 13, 14.

one's judgment of him, at this pitiful outside. And then, again, he speaks mysteriously of some secret temptation, of a "thorn in the flesh" which he likens to "a messenger of Satan set to buffet him," permitted by God to fasten on him lest he should be too elate with pride (2 Cor. xii. 7–10). Thrice he has besought of the Lord to be delivered, and thrice the Lord has answered him, "My grace is sufficient for thee." This seems to have been some bodily infirmity,[1] since we cannot well ascribe it to carnal passion, which he tells us (1 Cor. vii. 7, 8) that he never felt. Paul never married. All his life shows a coldness of physical temperament corresponding to the matchless heat of his brain; and he speaks of it with an openness which does not wholly please us, and might even be charged with a touch of affectation.[2]

Paul came to Jerusalem when young (Acts xxiii. 3, xxvi. 4), and is said to have been a pupil of Gamaliel, though he does not speak of this where it would have been natural (Phil. iii. 5); and the maxims of Gamaliel (Acts v. 34) are wholly opposed to Paul's conduct before his conversion. Gamaliel was the most enlightened man in Jerusalem, which may account for his being mentioned by the writer of "Acts" (xxii. 3) as Paul's teacher. Since every Jew of mark, not of the priestly families, was likely to be called a Pharisee, Gamaliel was held to belong to that sect; but he was far from sharing its narrow and intolerant spirit. He was a man of clear

[1] Possibly, as some have suggested, imperfect sight or partial blindness since the vision near Damascus: see John Brown's *Horæ Subsecivæ*. — Ed.

[2] 1 Cor. ix. 5., which is partly offset by Phil. iv. 3. Compare Clem. Alex., *Strom.* iii. 6; Euseb. iii. 30. The passage 1 Cor. vii. 7, 8, has most weight.

and open intelligence, understanding the pagans and acquainted with Greek.[1] Perhaps the broad views held by Paul when he had become a Christian were a reminiscence of his former master's teaching, though his first lesson surely was not to acquire his moderation. In the heated atmosphere of Jerusalem he came to be a fanatic in high degree. He was at the head of the party of young Pharisees, rigourist and high-strung, who carried to the last extreme their attachment to the nation's past.[2] He had not known Jesus,[3] and was not present at the bloody scene of Calvary. But we have seen him taking an active part in the killing of Stephen, and in the foremost rank of persecutors of the Church. He "breathed out threatenings and slaughter," and ranged throughout Jerusalem like a very madman, carrying a commission that sanctioned all his violences. He went from synagogue to synagogue, compelling the timid to forswear the name of Jesus, and scourging or imprisoning the rest.[4] When the Church was scattered, his rage extended to the neighbouring villages (Acts xxvi. 11); he was enraged at the rapid progress of the new faith, and, learning that a group of disciples had been formed at Damascus, he sought of the high-priest Theophilus, son of Hanan,[5] letters to the synagogue there, which would give him power to arrest the misbelievers and bring them bound to Jerusalem (Acts ix. 1, 2, 14; xxii. 5; xxvi. 12).

[1] See "Life of Jesus," p. 240.

[2] Gal. i. 13, 14; Acts xxii. 3, xxvi. 5.

[3] This is not implied in 2 Cor. v. 16. Even if Paul were at Jerusalem at the same time with Jesus, it does not follow that they had seen each other.

[4] Acts xxii. 4, 19; xxvi. 10, 11.

[5] High-priest from 37 to 42 : Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5 : 3; xix. 6 : 2.

These arbitrary acts of violence are explained by the disturbed condition of the Roman power in Judæa since the death of Tiberius, and the reign of the madman Caligula. The administration was in confusion everywhere. What was lost to the civil power was gained to fanaticism. After the dismissal of Pilate and the concessions made by Vitellius, the practice was to leave the country to be governed under its own laws. A thousand local tyrannies profited by the weakness of a power that had grown regardless. Damascus, too, had fallen into the hands of the Nabathæan king, Hartat or Hâreth, whose capital was at Petra.[1] This brave and powerful prince, having beaten Herod Antipas, and made head against the Roman force commanded by Vitellius, the imperial legate, had been marvellously served by fortune. News of the death of Tiberius (March 16, 37) had brought a sudden check to Vitellius.[2] Hâreth had seized Damascus and established there an ethnarch or governor.[3] The Jews made a considerable population here at this period, and made many proselytes, especially of women.[4] The way to satisfy them was to grant more local privileges, and every such concession was a license to religious violence. To punish and kill those who did not believe with them was their notion of liberty and independence.

When Paul left Jerusalem, he doubtless followed the usual road, crossing the Jordan at the "bridge

[1] See *Rev. numism.* 1858, pp. 296, 362; *Rev. archéol.* Apr. 1864, p. 284.

[2] Jos. *War*, ii. 20: 2.

[3] 2 Cor. xi. 32. There is no gap for the time of Caligula and Claudius in the series of Roman coins of Damascus. The coin stamped "Aretas Philhellene" seems to be of this Hâreth (communicated by Mr. Waddington).

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 5: 1, 3.

of the daughters of Jacob." His mental excitement was extreme, and at times he seems to have lost his self-control. Passion is not a rule of faith. Under the influence of passion a man will veer from one belief to the opposite, carrying into it all the former virulence. Like all strong souls, he was on the verge of loving the object of his hate. Was he sure, indeed, that he was not opposing the work of God? The calm and judicious views of his teacher Gamaliel would perhaps come back to his thought. Such eager natures have violent revulsions. He felt the charm of those whom he tortured.[1] The more he knew of these good sectaries, the more he was attracted to them, and none could know them so well as their persecutor. At times he would seem to see the mild countenance of the Master who inspired such patience in his followers, gazing upon him with an expression of pity and tender reproach. He would be deeply impressed by the accounts of visions of Jesus, sometimes visible in his heavenly existence; for when there is general belief in the marvellous, tales of the marvellous equally impress the most opposite parties; thus Moslems feel dread of the miracles of Elijah, and, like Christians, supplicate miraculous cures of Saint George or Saint Anthony. Paul, having passed through Ituræa, had come upon the broad plain of Damascus. He was drawing near the city, and had probably reached the circuit of gardens surrounding it. It was high noon.[2] He had several companions with him, and seems to have been on foot.[3]

The road from Jerusalem to Damascus is very little

[1] Compare the conversion of Omar: Ibn Hisham, *Sirat errasoul*, p. 226.

[2] Acts ix. 3; xxii. 6; xxvi. 13.

[3] Acts. ix. 4, 8; xxii. 7, 11; xxvi. 14, 16.

changed. Proceeding from Damascus toward the southwest, it crosses the beautiful plain watered by the affluents of the Abana and Pharpar, on which, at nearly equal distances, are now the villages of Dareya, Kaukab, and Sasa. It would be idle to seek the spot we have now in mind — the scene of one of the most important events in human history — at a greater distance than Kaukab, four hours' journey from Damascus (where mediæval tradition has fixed it); and it is even likely to have been much nearer the city, perhaps at Dareya, a distance of an hour and a half, or between that and the extremity of the Meidan.[1] Paul was now right in front of the city, some of whose buildings must have been in sight among the trees. Behind him was the majestic dome of Mount Hermon, with its snowy gorges, which make it look like the whitened head of an old man; on his right was the Hauran, two low parallel ridges enclosing the lower course of the Pharpar (*Nahr el-Awadj*) and the mounds (*Tuleil*) of the lake region; and on his left the lower foot-hills of the Anti-Lebanon, swelling up toward Hermon. The impression of these richly cultivated plains and these delightful orchards, separated by narrow canals and laden with the fairest fruits, is one of calmness and enjoyment. Imagine a shaded highway lying open in a plain of deep soil, constantly drained by irrigating-ditches, bordered by sloping banks, winding among olive, nut, apricot, and plum trees linked by climbing vines, and you will have a picture of the spot where befell that singular event which has had such influence on the faith of mankind. In these environs of Damascus (some 5,600 feet

[1] As would appear from Acts ix. 3, 8; xxii. 6, 11.

above the sea-level) you hardly believe that you are in the East. On leaving the hot and arid regions of Gaulonitis and Ituræa, your chief emotion is delight at finding yourself once more among the works of man and the benedictions of the sky. Since the remotest antiquity, and until now, the entire zone which girdles Damascus with freshness and delight has had but one name, has inspired but one dream, that of the "Paradise of God."

If Paul found terrible visions in such a region, it was because he already bore them in his soul. Every step he took toward Damascus wakened burning perplexities within him. The hateful task of executioner, which he was on his way to discharge, was becoming unendurable. These houses just coming into view are perhaps the home of his destined victims! Such a thought oppresses him, and blocks his path. He would fain go no farther: it is as if he were bearing against a goad that pierces him (Acts xxvi. 14). The fatigue of the road — a week's heavy travel — adds to this distress and breaks him down. His eyes appear to have been inflamed,[1] very probably a symptom of ophthalmia, due to the long exposures of the journey, in which the last hours are the most dangerous. At such a time all the enfeebling effects of toiling in the sun and dust are at their worst, and when the nerves are once relaxed a violent reaction may set in. The sudden change, again, from the sun-beaten plain to the cool shadow of the gardens, may have caused, or at least aggravated, a crisis in a system already predisposed to such ailment, and now unnerved by the fatigue and excitement of

[1] Acts ix. 8, 9, 18; xxii. 11, 13.

this fanatic's journey. Dangerous attacks of fever, accompanied by rush of blood to the head, are common in this region, with the suddenness of a stroke of lightning. When the crisis is past, there remains an impression as of a dark night shot through with lightning-flashes, and of images relieved against a black[1] background. In the case of Paul what happened was, that a violent shock of some sort deprived him in an instant of all clear consciousness that yet remained in him, and threw him upon the earth senseless.

Comparing the several accounts that have come to us of this event, which won over to Christianity its most zealous apostle,[2] we cannot say confidently whether or not any outward incident brought it about. But, in such a case as this, the outward incident counts for little. The real ground of Paul's conversion was his state of mind, his remorse on coming close to the city where his guilt was to be crowned by the final act. We know that in kindred cases — as among the Mormons or in an American "revival" — conversion is wrought during an extreme nervous tension giving rise to hallucinations. For my own part I strongly incline to the view that the incident (whatever it may have been) was personal to Paul himself, and perceived by none of his companions. That they are said to have seen and heard what he did may be a legendary addition, especially as the accounts vary (see Acts ix. 7; xxii. 9;

[1] I myself had an attack of this sort at Byblos; and, but for my fixed opinions on this subject, should certainly have taken my illusions for real visions.

[2] We have three accounts, viz. : Acts ix. 1–9; xxii. 5–11; xxvi. 12–18. From these it is clear that Paul himself varied in his statements, while that in chap. ix. is not wholly self-consistent, as will appear. Compare Gal. i. 15–17; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8; Acts ix. 27.

xxvi. 13). Most of the accounts say nothing of a fall from his horse.[1] There is no reason to doubt that, at a precise moment, he had a vision which decided his conversion. It is not unlikely that a thunderstorm burst forth suddenly at this moment.[2] The flanks of Mount Hermon are the gathering place of such storms, which are of unparalleled violence. The coolest heads cannot pass through such sheets of flame without emotion. All antiquity, as we must remember, regarded such phenomena as special divine manifestations. With the ideas then held as to Providence, nothing was fortuitous; every man regarded the natural phenomena taking place about him as having some direct relation to himself. The Jews, in particular, always listened to thunder as the voice of God, and looked on lightning as the fire of God. Paul was at this moment under the most violent agitation of mind; and, naturally, he would ascribe to the noise of the storm what was really the voice of his own heart. It is of small account whether a feverish delirium caused by a sunstroke or an attack of ophthalmia, seized him all at once; or whether a flash of lightning long dazzled and bewildered him; or whether a thunder-clap stunned him, causing a disturbance of the brain that for a time completely overwhelmed him. His recollections as to this seem much confused. To him the fact was supernatural, and, under such a conviction, outward circumstances could make no clear impression. Such mental disturbances sometimes have a retroactive effect, and utterly

[1] It is unreasonable to reject the account in Acts ix. on the ground of the expression "to reveal in me" (Gal. i. 16), which is parallel to "glorified God in me" (ver. 24), and means simply, "in respect of me.

[2] Acts ix. 3, 7; xxii. 6, 9, 11; xxvi. 13.

blur out one's memory of what has happened for some moments previously.[1] Paul, too, himself tells us (2 Cor. xii. 1–9) that he was subject to visions. A circumstance quite unimportant in another's eyes might be sufficient to put him wholly beside himself.

Amid these illusions, to which his senses were enthralled, what did he really see and hear? He saw the Form that during these last many days had followed him, of which so many tales were already current, — Jesus himself,[2] who spoke to him in Hebrew: "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" Impetuous natures pass by a single step from one extreme to the other.[3] For them there are what colder natures cannot know, critical moments which fix the destiny of a lifetime. Men of reflection do not change thus, but undergo a gradual transformation. A fiery nature, on the other hand, may change, but does not pass through those steps. Dogmatism is like a Nessus' shirt, which it cannot tear away. They need a pretext whether for love or hate. Only in our Western races are found those broadly balanced minds, delicate, strong, and pliant, misled by no sudden illusion, deceived by no shallow assertion. Such minds have never existed in the East. Within a few seconds all his deepest thoughts flashed through the soul of Paul. He saw vividly the horror of his conduct; he saw himself stained with the martyr blood of Stephen, who was now to him as a father and an instructor. He was keenly stricken, utterly over-

[1] It was so with me at Byblos, so that I absolutely lost all memory of the day before that of the attack.

[2] Acts ix. 27; Gal. i. 16; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8; Clementine Homilies, xvii. 13–19.

[3] Thus of Omar, in *Sirat errasoul*, 226 *et seq.*

whelmed. But, really, only the form of his fanaticism was changed. His very sincerity, his need of absolute faith, forbade him any middle ground. One thing was plain, he would hereafter display the same fiery zeal for Jesus that he had hitherto put forth against him.

He entered Damascus, by help of his companions, who led him by the hand (Acts ix. 8; xxii. 11). They left him with a certain Judas, living in the street called "Straight." This is a great avenue, with colonnades, more than a mile long, more than a hundred feet broad, which traverses the city from east to west, its course still forming, with some slight deviations, the chief thoroughfare of Damascus.[1] The dazed condition and agitation of his mind was still intense as before. For three days of high fever Paul neither ate nor drank. What passed meanwhile in his heated brain, disturbed by the violent shock, we may only conjecture. Some of the Christians in Damascus were spoken of in his presence, among them a certain Ananias (Hananiah), who seems to have been their leader.[2] Paul had often before heard of the miraculous healing powers of the Christians, and was possessed by the thought that the laying-on of hands would work his cure. His eyes were still highly inflamed. Among the forms that flitted through his brain he seemed to see Ananias

[1] The old Arabic name was *Tarik el-Adhwa*, but it is now called *Tarik el-Mustekim*, equivalent to ῥύμη εὐρεῖα. The eastern gate (*Bâb Sharki*) and a few traces of the colonnades still exist. See Arabic texts in Wustenfeld (*Zeitschr. für vergleichende Erdkunde*, 1842, p. 168); Porter (*Syria and Palestine*), 477; Wilson (*Lands of the Bible*), ii. 345, 351, 352.

[2] The account in Acts ix. seems to consist of an earlier narrative, including ver. 9, 11, 18, enlarged by a later legendary one, including more both of narrative and dialogue, with ver. 9, 10, 11, 13–18; ver. 12 seems to stand alone. That in xxii. 12–16 contains more of the latter.

(Acts ix. 12), who entered and touched him with the gesture customary among Christians. Hence a fixed persuasion that Ananias would be the agent of his cure. Ananias was sent for, came, spoke gently to the sufferer, called him "brother," and laid hands upon his head. From this moment calmness returned to the mind of Paul. He believed himself to be already healed; and, since the malady was chiefly nervous, he was so. Little incrustations ("scales") fell, it is said, from his eyelids;[1] he ate, and recovered his strength.

He was baptised without delay. The doctrine he was required to profess was so simple that he had nothing new to learn. He was a Christian on the spot, and a Christian completely furnished. Besides, from whom should he receive further instruction? Jesus himself had appeared to him, — the risen Jesus, just as to James and Peter. All his doctrine he had received by direct revelation. Here, again, we see the haughty and indomitable nature of Paul. When cast down upon the highway, he was ready at once to submit himself, but to Jesus alone, who had come down from the right hand of the Father to convert and instruct him. This makes the basis of his faith; this will hereafter be the point of departure for his claims. He will maintain that, of his own mind, he avoided returning to Jerusalem directly after his conversion, that so he might be in direct relations with those who were apostles before him; for he has received his own special revelation, and owes nothing to any man; he too, like the Twelve, is an apostle by divine appointment and by a commission direct from Jesus; his doctrine is sound,

[1] Acts ix. 18; comp. Tobit, ii. 9; vi. 10; xi. 13.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

even though an angel should say the contrary.[1] With this haughty convert there came a great peril into the bosom of that little community of the "poor in spirit," which hitherto has made up the Christian body. It will be a real miracle if his high temper and unbending personality do not shatter it in pieces. But then, what an element of unspeakable value will be his hardihood, his independent vigour, his positive decision, beside that narrow, timid, irresolute temper of the saints at Jerusalem! If Christianity had continued in the hands of those excellent people, shut up in a conventicle of "new lights" living a life in common, it would almost certainly, like Essenism, have died and left no sign. This unteachable Paul will prove the creator of its destinies; it is he who, at the risk of whatever peril, will bravely launch the ship into the deep sea. Side by side with the obedient disciple, who without a word accepts his faith from his superior, we shall find one who is free of all authority, who believes only from personal conviction. Already, but five years after the death of Jesus, Protestantism is born: its glorious founder is Saint Paul. We may suppose that Jesus never looked forward to disciples such as he; but it is they, perhaps, who have done the most to keep his work alive, and to render it immortal.

A violent and headlong nature, forced to change its faith, will find only a new object of its passion. As ardent for the new as he had been for the old, Paul, like Omar, passed in one day from the part of persecutor to that of apostle. He did not return to Jeru-

[1] Gal. i. 1, 8, 9, 11–14; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xi. 23; xv. 8, 9; Col. i. 25; Eph. i. 19; iii. 3, 7, 8; Acts xx. 24; xxii. 14, 15, 21; xxvi. 16; Clem. Hom. xvii. 13–19.

salem (Gal. i. 17), where there would have been something embarrassing in his position toward the Twelve. He remained at Damascus and in the Hauran, — "in Arabia," of which province the Hauran is the chief district, — and here for three years (38–41) continued to preach that Jesus was the Son of God.[1] Herod Agrippa now held sovereignty in the Hauran and neighbouring districts; but his power was held in check at sundry points by Hâreth (Aretas) the Nabathæan king. The weakening of Roman power in Syria had given over to the ambitious Arab the great and rich city of Damascus, as well as a part of the region eastward of Hermon and the Jordan, which were then just in the springtime of a new civilisation.[2] Another Emir, Soheym,[3] — perhaps a lieutenant or relation of Hâreth, — was claiming from Caligula the principality of Ituræa. Amid this great awakening of the Arab race,[4] — on that strange soil, where an impulsive breed of men were making a brilliant display of heated activity, — Paul shed the first flame of his apostolic spirit (Gal. i. 16). It may be that the brilliant secular energy that was making this a new country hurt the effect of a manifesto wholly idealistic and resting on belief in the approaching end of the world. At all events, we find no trace of a church in Arabia founded by Saint Paul. If the region of the Hauran became

[1] Gal. i. 17–20; Acts ix. 19–22; xxvi. 20. The writer of Acts (xxii. 17) thinks that the stay at Damascus was very brief, and that, after his conversion, Paul went to Jerusalem and preached there. But Galatians is decisive.

[2] See inscriptions found by Waddington and Vogüé (*Rev. archéol.*, Apr. 1864); *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des inscr.* 1865, 106–108.

[3] Dion Cass. lix. 12.

[4] See *Bulletin archéol.* (Longpérier, &c.), Sept. 1856.

about A. D. 70 one of the important centres of Christianity, this was due to the flight of Christians from Palestine, and the chief share in it belongs to the Ebionites, the special enemies of Paul.

Paul had a larger hearing at Damascus, where there were many Jews.[1] He went into their synagogues, where he argued warmly to prove that Jesus was the true Messiah. There was great astonishment among the disciples, that one who had persecuted their brothers in Jerusalem, and had come hither to throw them into chains, had become their chief advocate (Acts ix. 20–22). His boldness and independence alarmed them; he was alone, and took counsel with no man (Gal. i. 16); he gathered no school; he was regarded with more curiosity than sympathy. They felt that he was a brother, but one who filled a place of his own. He was believed to be incapable of treachery; but these kind-hearted and commonplace natures always feel a certain distrust and alarm when brought in touch with those which are potent and original, which, as they feel, must one day be beyond their control.

[1] Jos. *War*, i. 2:25; ii. 20:2.

CHAPTER XI.

THE CHURCH IN JUDÆA. — A. D. 38-41.

During the three years following Paul's conversion (38–41) the Church seems to have incurred no persecution (Acts ix. 31). The disciples no doubt took precautions which they had neglected before the death of Stephen, and spoke no more so openly in public. It may be, too, that the new sect was favoured by the disasters that befell the Jews in the later years of Caligula, with whom they were in constant struggle. The better terms they were on with the Romans, in fact, so much the worse was their persecuting temper. To purchase or reward their good behaviour, the Roman officials were induced to enlarge their privileges, — in particular what they valued most, the right of putting to death those whom they judged guilty before their Law.[1] The period of time that now occupies us, it may be remarked, was among the stormiest to be found in the stormy annals of this strange people.

Never was there a time when the hatred felt by their neighbours against the Jews by reason of their aggressive morality, their queer customs, and the obstinacy of their temper, raged more bitterly than now, especially in Alexandria.[2] To meet these arrears of hate, the trans-

[1] See the shockingly candid story in 3 Macc. vii. 12, 13.

[2] As we see by comparing "Esther" with the third (apocryphal) book of Maccabees.

fer of the Empire from one of the most dangerous of maniacs that ever reigned offered a favourable chance. Caligula, ever since the malady that completed the ruin of his sanity (in October, 37), had shown the fearful spectacle of a madman ruling the world with the most enormous powers ever grasped in the hand of man. Such horrors were made possible, and were made remediless, by the disastrous law of succession among the Cæsars. This horror lasted for three years and three months. The historian blushes to tell in sober narrative what must follow. Before entering upon the lewd and bloody story, he must say, with Suetonius, "What follows is to be told as of a prodigy in nature" (*Reliqua ut de monstro narranda sunt*).

The most harmless folly of this madman was his care for his own divinity.[1] In this he displayed a certain bitter irony, a mixture of the grave and comic (for this monster lacked not wit), and a deep contempt of the human race. Enemies of the Jews saw what gain they might make of this insanity. So abased was the religious condition of the time that there rose not one protest against the Cæsar's sacrilege; every local creed made haste to decree to him the titles and honours it paid exclusively to its own divinity. It is the everlasting glory of the Jews that amid all this base idolatry they raised the outcry of the outraged conscience. They alone affirmed that theirs was the absolute religion, and refused to bend before the tyrant's hateful caprice. This was to them the beginning of entanglements without end. If in one city there was one man who had a quarrel with the synagogue, whether out of spite or mere

[1] Suet. *Caius*, 22, 52; Dion Cass. lix. 26–28; Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 25; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 8; xix. 1:1, 2; *War*, ii. 10.

trickery, that was enough to bring about frightful consequences. One day it might be that an altar to Caligula was found on the spot where it could least be tolerated by the Jews;[1] another day a mob of street-Arabs would be hooting "Shame!" because the Jews alone refused to erect the emperor's statue in their house of prayer. Then there would be a rush upon the synagogues and shrines, where the bust of Caligula would be set up,[2] and the unhappy wretches were put to the alternative of renouncing their religion or incurring the guilt of treason. And so the most dreadful annoyances would follow.

Such jests had been practised more than once, when the emperor was inspired with a thought yet more devilish: it was to set up a colossal golden statue of himself in the most holy place of the Temple at Jerusalem, and to dedicate the Temple itself to his own divinity.[3] This odious scheme had nearly hastened by thirty years the great revolt and the ruin of the Jewish nation. This catastrophe was averted by the moderation of the imperial legate, Publius Petronius, and the interposition of Herod Agrippa, a favourite of Caligula. But the Jews lived everywhere in terror until the world was delivered by Cheræa's sword from the most execrable tyrant it had as yet endured. Philo (*Leg.* 27, 30, 44) has preserved to us the details of that unexampled scene when his legation was admitted to an interview with the emperor. It was during his visit to the villas of Mæcenas and Lamia, near the sea, not

[1] Philo, *Leg. ad Caium*, 30.

[2] *Ibid.* 18, 20, 26, 43; *In Flaccum*, 7.

[3] Philo, *Leg.* 39; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 8; *War*, ii. 10; *Tac. Ann.* xii. 54, with *Hist.* v. 9.

far from Puteoli, while he was in a vein of gaiety, and his chief jester Helicon had just been repeating to him all manner of buffooneries about the Jews. "Ah, it is you, then," said he with a bitter laugh, showing his teeth; "you who alone will not confess me a god, and choose rather to worship one whom you cannot even call by name!" With these words there went a frightful blasphemy. The Jews trembled; their opponents from Alexandria claimed the first word: "Your Majesty," said they, "would detest these men and all their nation even more, if you knew the hate they have for you. They are the only ones who did not sacrifice for your health when every other nation did it." At these words the Jews cried out that this was a calumny, that they had three times offered sacrifice, the most solemn which their rite allowed, for the emperor's prosperity. "Be it so," replied Caligula, with a very droll gravity, "that you have sacrificed, it is well; but you did not sacrifice to me, and what gain have I of it?" Thereupon he turned his back on them and began to run through the apartments, up and down stairs without stopping, while he gave orders for repairs. The unhappy deputies — among them Philo, a man advanced in years,[1] perhaps the most venerated man of his time, since Jesus was no more — followed him up and down, out of breath, trembling, exposed to the jeers of the bystanders. Turning about of a sudden, "By the way," cried Caligula, "why is it that you don't eat pork?" His flatterers burst out a-laughing; while some officers, in a severe tone, warned them that their immoderate mirth was an offence to the imperial majesty. The

[1] "Of eighty years," says the text, but more commonly thought to be about sixty. — ED.

Jews stammered, and one of them said, rather awkwardly, "But there are some people who don't eat lamb." "As to those people," said the emperor, "they are quite right; that is a tasteless kind of meat!" He then affected to interest himself in their business; but hardly was the speech begun when he left them again, to give orders for the decoration of a hall which he wished to ornament with a sparkling stone. Coming back with an air of moderation, he asked the envoys if they had anything more to say; and, as they were resuming the interrupted speech, he turned his back on them again, and went to inspect another hall, which he was having adorned with pictures. This tiger's-sport, playing with his victims, lasted for hours. The Jews were waiting for the death-stroke, but at the last moment the tiger-claws drew back. "Come!" said Caligula, resuming his walk, "I swear these people are not so guilty as they are to be pitied for not believing in my divinity." So mockingly might the gravest questions be treated under this horrible rule, created by the baseness of mankind, cherished by a soldiery and a populace equally vile, sustained by the cowardice of almost all!

So strained a situation, as we easily see, took from the Jews under Marullus much of the boldness which made them so proud and fierce in the presence of Pilate. The Christians were now almost sundered from the Temple, and must have been far less terrified than the Jews at the impious designs of Caligula. They were, besides, too few to be well known or much heeded at Rome. The tempest of Caligula's day, like that which ended in the capture of Jerusalem under Titus, passed over their heads, and was even in many

ways serviceable to them. Whatever weakened Jewish independence was a help to them, since it was so much abated from the power of a suspicious orthodoxy, which followed up its claims with severe penalties.

This period of repose was fruitful of inward growth. The Church, still in its springtide, was becoming divided into three provinces, Judæa, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts ix. 31), Damascus being doubtless an appendage to the last. Jerusalem still held its unquestioned primacy. The Church here, which had dispersed after the death of Stephen, quickly rallied. The apostles had never left the city, while "the Lord's brethren" still resided there, invested with high authority (Gal. i. 18, 19; ii. 9). This new church at Jerusalem seems not to have been organised so strictly as the earlier; community of goods was no longer found in it. There was, at most, a generous chest for the poor, which was to receive the gifts ever flowing in from the local churches to the mother-church, the fountain and the permanent well-spring of their faith (Acts xi. 29, 30).

Peter continued to make frequent apostolic visits in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem (Acts ix. 32), still retaining high repute as a wonder-worker. At Lydda (now Ludd), in particular, he is said (Acts ix. 32–35) to have healed a paralytic named Æneas, which marvellous cure led to many conversions in the plain of Sharon (ix. 32–35). From Lydda he proceeded to Joppa (Jaffa), which seems to have been a centre for the new faith, which found its most favourable opportunity in towns of workingmen, sailors, and the poorer classes, where Jewish orthodoxy held no control.[1] Peter remained

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10:6.

long at Joppa, living with a tanner named Simon, near the sea.[1] Working in leather was esteemed an occupation almost "unclean," so that one should have little to do with those who dealt in it, tanners or curriers, who were thus compelled to live in quarters apart.[2] Peter, by this choice of residence, showed his indifference to Jewish prejudice, and added his share in the ennobling of the humbler forms of industry, which is largely the work of the Christian spirit.

The organising of works of charity, meanwhile, went on actively. In the church at Joppa was an admirable woman, in Aramaic called Tabitha (*gazelle*), and in Greek Dorcas,[3] who devoted all her labours to the poor (Acts ix. 36–43). She appears to have been rich, and to have bestowed her wealth in charity. This honourable lady had formed a circle of pious widows, who passed their days with her in weaving garments for the needy. As the break between Christianity and Judaism was not yet complete, Jews are likely to have shared in these charitable gifts. The phrase "saints and widows" (ix. 41) thus probably denotes a class of pious persons, like those of modern religious houses, whose task it is to do good to all, suspected only by the rigourists of a pedantic orthodoxy, "minor brethren" beloved of the people, devout, charitable, pitiful.

The germ of these associations of women, which make one of the glories of Christianity, thus existed in the first churches of Judæa. At Jaffa began the

[1] Acts ix. 43; x. 6, 17, 32.

[2] Mishna, *Ketuboth*, vii. 10.

[3] Gruter, 891, 4; Reinesius, *Inscr.* xiv. 61; Mommsen, *Inscr. regni Neap.* 622, 2034, 3092, 4985; Pape, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen;* Jos. *War*, iv. 3:6.

succession of those women, clad in veils and linen garments, who were to continue through centuries the sacred tradition of their charities. Tabitha was the mother of a household which will have no end so long as there are miseries to relieve, or kindly feminine sympathies to satisfy. The later account adds that Peter raised her from the dead. Death, alas! senseless and repulsive as in such a case it always is, is also pitiless. When the loveliest spirit is breathed away, the sentence is without recall; the noblest of women, no less than the most frivolous and vulgar, is deaf to the appeal of the dear voices that would call her back. But the spirit is not subject to material conditions. Virtue and loving-kindness escape the grasp of death. Needless that Tabitha should be revived! A few days more to pass in this vale of tears, — were it well for that to call her away from her blest and unchanging eternity? Let her rest in peace! the day of the just will come.

In these towns of mixed population, the question of the admission of pagans to baptism was very urgent. Peter's mind was greatly occupied with it. One day, while praying on the tanner's housetop, in view of the sea that was soon to bear the new faith throughout the Empire, he fell into a trance, or prophetic ecstasy. While still between sleep and waking, he felt a sensation of hunger, and asked for food. While this was getting ready, he saw in vision the sky opened and a sheet let down, knotted at the four corners. Looking within the sheet, he saw living creatures of various sorts, and seemed to hear a voice, saying to him, "Rise, Peter, kill and eat." Objecting to this that many of the creatures were unclean, and thus forbidden as food, he heard the further words, "What God hath purified

call not thou unclean." The act, it appears, was three times repeated. Peter was convinced that these creatures represented symbolically the mass of gentiles [gathered within the four corners of the earth], and that God himself had made them fit for the holy companionship of the kingdom of God.[1]

An occasion was soon found to put these principles to practice. From Joppa Peter went on to Cæsarea, and here he met a centurion named Cornelius (Acts x. 1–xi. 18). The garrison at Cæsarea was partly made up from one of the volunteer Italian cohorts (*Italicæ*), of which there appear to have been at least thirty-two;[2] and its commander was Cornelius, who is thus shown to have been an Italian and a Roman citizen. He was a man of upright character, who had long felt himself drawn toward the monotheistic faith of the Jews. He prayed, gave alms, and in general practised those precepts of natural religion assumed in Judaism; but he was not circumcised or even in any sense a proselyte, but a pious pagan, an Israelite at heart, and nothing more — like the good centurion in Luke (vii. 2–10).[3] His whole household and a few soldiers of his company are said to have been inclined to the same course (Acts x. 2, 7). Cornelius sought admission into the new church. Peter, whose disposition was frank and friendly, acceded to the request, and the centurion was baptised.[4] It is possible that Peter did not at first see

[1] Acts x. 9–16; xi. 5–10.

[2] Orelli & Henzen, *Inscr. lat.* 90, 512, 6756. The full name of that at Cæsarea may have been *cohors prima Augusta Italica civium Romanorum* (Acts xxvii. 1; Henzen, 6709).

[3] The example of *Izatus* (Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2:5) proves that such cases did exist. Comp. Jos. *War*, ii. 28:2; Orelli, 2523.

[4] This seems, it is true, to contradict Gal. ii. 7–9; but Peter was always very inconsistent about the admission of Gentiles.

any difficulty in this; but when he went back to Jerusalem he met sharp remonstrances. He had openly violated the Law; he had entered in among the uncircumcised and eaten with them. It was, in fact, a fundamental question. This case would decide whether the Law were abolished; whether it might be violated in the case of proselytes; whether Gentiles could be received openly into the Church. To defend himself, Peter told of his vision at Joppa; and afterwards the case of the centurion served as an argument in the great controversy of baptising the uncircumcised. To strengthen his position, it was held that every step in the affair had been directed by a command from heaven. After long prayers, it was related, Cornelius had seen an angel, who commanded him to go to search for Peter at Joppa; that Peter's symbolic vision took place at the very moment when the messengers of Cornelius were just arrived; and further, that God himself had specially sanctioned all that had been done, for, after the Holy Spirit had in baptism descended upon Cornelius and his household, they had spoken with tongues, and had joined in the singing of psalms in the same way with the other disciples. Could baptism, indeed, be denied to those who had received the Holy Spirit?

The church at Jerusalem was still made up exclusively of Jews and proselytes. To them it seemed very strange that the Spirit should be shed upon the uncircumcised before their baptism. From this time forth, we may assume, there was a party among them opposed on principle to the admission of gentiles, and to some Peter's explanations were not admissible. In Acts (xi. 18) their acceptance appears to have been unanimous; but, within a few years, we shall find the question re-

vived with much more asperity (xv. 1–5). The case of the good centurion, like that of the Ethiopian eunuch, was probably allowed to pass, as an exceptional case, justified by a special revelation; but the matter was far from being decided. It made the first controversy within the Church, whose paradise of interior tranquillity had by that time lasted six or seven years.

Somewhere in the year 40, this momentous question, on which the future of Christianity depended, was thus thrown open. Peter and Philip had sagaciously divined the true solution, and had baptised pagans. The two accounts which we find in "Acts," of which each seems to have been partly modelled on the other, will appear on examination to have been composed on system [*Tendenz*]. The writer belongs to the party of peace, which favoured the admission of gentiles, and was reluctant to acknowledge the violent dissensions that had followed. In writing of the eunuch, the centurion, and even the conversion of Samaritans, it is very clear that his intention is not only to tell the fact, but to find precedents for a judgment. Still, we cannot admit that he invented his facts. The conversion of the queen of Ethiopia's eunuch, and that of the centurion Cornelius, may be taken to be real events, set in their present form by a writer who composed his account according to the needs of the time at which he wrote.

Here we note that Paul, who ten or eleven years later laid such stress upon this question, has as yet no hand in it. He was still in the Hauran, or at Damascus, engaged in his task of preaching, arguing with the Jews, displaying all the energy in defence of the new faith that he had formerly shown in his attacks upon it. The

same bigotry which had before used him as its tool was now just as hot in its pursuit of him. The Jews, determined to break him down, got an order for his arrest from the local officer (ethnarch) who governed Damascus in the name of Hâreth (Aretas), and Paul hid himself. To please the Jews, the governor set guards at the gates to seize him, knowing that he would try to escape; but the disciples let him down by night in a basket from the window of a house that jutted over the city wall;[1] and so he was safe.

Clear of this danger, Paul once more thought of returning to Jerusalem. He had now been for three years a Christian (Gal. i. 18), but as yet had met none of the apostles. His sturdy, unbending temper, inclined to solitude, had at first made him turn his back, as it were, upon the whole of the great household he had entered against his will, and choose for his first field of labour a new region, where he would find no associate. But now there had risen in him a desire to see Peter (Gal. i. 18), whose leading rank he acknowledged, speaking of him, as others did, by the name *Kepha*, "the Rock." And so he returned to Jerusalem by the same road that he had traversed three years before, in so opposite a state of mind.

At Jerusalem he found himself in an exceedingly false and embarrassing position. The story had reached there, that the persecutor had become the most zealous of champions, the ablest defender of the faith he had set out to destroy (Gal. i. 23); but there were still strong prejudices against him. Many feared that the whole thing was a diabolical plot of his contriving. He had been known to be so infuriated, so cruel, so

[1] 2 Cor. ii. 32, 33; Acts ix. 23–25.

eager to break into houses and wrench open family secrets in search of his victims, that he was thought capable of playing that hateful farce, so as the more effectually to ruin those he hated (Acts ix. 26). He seems at this time to have lived in Peter's house (Gal. i. 18). Many of the disciples refused to listen to his advances, and kept their distance; but Barnabas, who was a man of heart and resolute, took just now a decisive step. As a native of Cyprus and a new convert, he understood Paul's position better than the Galilæan disciples could. He came straight to him, took him by the hand (so to speak), introduced him to the most suspicious among them, pledging himself for his fidelity (Acts ix. 27). We cannot be quite sure that this generous act of Barnabas belongs to the short time (of two weeks) which Paul now spent in Jerusalem; but the account undoubtedly gives a correct view of the true relations between the two. By this sagacious act of kindness, Barnabas earned the warmest gratitude of the Christian world. He first saw clearly who and what Paul was; to him it is that the Church owes the most eminent among its founders. The friendship of these two apostolic men, — a friendship so rich in results, unshadowed by any cloud in spite of many a disagreement, afterwards brought about their close association in the field of missionary labour among the Gentiles. Their friendship, as we may say, dates from this first stay of Paul in Jerusalem. Among the early causes of the world's faith we must reckon that generous act when Barnabas held out his hand to Paul, then suspected and forsaken; that penetrating intuition which made him discover the soul of an apostle under the aspect of humiliation; that prompt frankness which

broke the ice and threw down the barrier created by the evil antecedents of this stranger-convert — perhaps too by certain traits in his own character — between him and those who were henceforth to be his brothers.

Paul, meanwhile, shunned the company of the apostles as if on system. It is he who says this, and takes pains even to confirm it by an oath: he saw (he says) only Peter and James "the Lord's brother" (Gal. i. 19, 20). His stay can hardly have lasted more than two weeks (*id.* i. 18). The Book of Acts differs from "Galatians" in making this stay both longer and sooner after his conversion, making too much, apparently, of certain murderous plots and complications (ix. 28, 29); but the epistle says, expressly, "fifteen days," and must here have the preference. It is true that, when he wrote "Galatians" (about 56), Paul was engaged in controversy, and under motives which may have warped his account, so as to represent the apostles as more dry and imperious in tone than perhaps they were. His motive, at this time, was to show that he had received no instructions at Jerusalem, and was in no sense the commissioned agent of the Twelve, who had their quarters in Jerusalem. Here (he insists) his bearing had been the lofty and independent bearing of a master who shuns the society of other masters, so as not even to seem to be their subordinate; not the penitent and humble bearing of a guilty man remorseful of his past, as would appear from the account in Acts. We cannot believe that in 41, within three years of his conversion, Paul was already prompted by the jealous anxiety to assert his independence which he showed at a later time. His scant dealings with the apostles and his short stay in Jerusalem were far more likely due to his embarrass-

ment in the company of persons so different in temper and strongly prejudiced against him than to a super-subtile policy, which led him to anticipate, fifteen years in advance, the annoyances that might come from too close intimacy with them.

In short, the "wall of partition" (as we may call it) which now stood between the apostolic group and Paul arose chiefly from the difference in their character and education. The apostles were all from Galilee; they had attended at none of the great Jewish schools; they had seen Jesus, and kept the memory of his words; they were good and pious natures, standing a little, now and then, upon their dignity, but with the open hearts of children. Paul was a man of action, full of fire, with but slight turn for mystical piety, enlisted by a power mightier than his own will in a sect which was in no sense his first choice. His habitual temper, as we see best in "Galatians," was that of protest and revolt. His Jewish training had been much more rigid than that of any among his new associates. But, according to the common view among Christians, he was at a great disadvantage in not having known Jesus, or being of his direct appointment. Now he was not the man to accept a secondary rank. His haughty individuality demanded an independent part. About this time, as we may suppose, the strange idea took root in his mind that, after all, he had no ground to think himself less favoured that those who had known Jesus and been of his adoption, — since he too had seen Jesus, and had received from him a direct revelation, with the charge of his apostolate. Even those who had been privileged to see the risen Christ in person had no advantage over him. Although the "last of all" (as he says), his own

vision had been no less remarkable than theirs; while it had been under circumstances that set upon it a peculiar seal of importance and distinction.[1] This was a great mistake! The discourse of even the humblest disciple of Jesus still had in it the echo of his voice. Paul, with all his Jewish learning, could not make good the great lack resulting from his late initiation. The Christ whom he had seen on the way to Damascus was not, whatever he might say, the Christ of Galilee, but the Christ of his own imagination, of his own proper senses. Diligent as he may have been to gather up the Master's very words,[2] he was in this only a disciple in the second degree. We may even doubt whether, if he had met Jesus in his lifetime, he would have been drawn to him. His doctrine must needs be his own, not that of Jesus; the revelations he is so proud of are the birth of his own brain.

Thoughts such as these, which he did not as yet venture to impart to any other, must have made Jerusalem an uncomfortable place of stay. At the end of the fifteen days he bade Peter adieu and left. He had seen so few that he could say that no one in all the churches of Judæa knew his face, or anything about him excepting by report (Gal. i. 22, 23). He afterwards alleged that this sudden departure was due to a revelation; saying that one day, while praying in the Temple, he saw Jesus in person, and received from him a command instantly to leave Jerusalem "because here they were not inclined to receive my testimony." In rec-

[1] Gal. i. 11, 12, and elsewhere; 1 Cor. ix. 1; xv. 8; 2 Cor. xi. 21–23; xii. 2–4.

[2] As we see, more or less directly, in Rom. xii. 14; 1 Cor. xiii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 6; 1 Thess. iv. 8; v. 2, 6.

ompense of these hardships, Jesus promised him the apostleship of distant nations, and an auditory more willing to receive his word (Acts xxii. 17–21). Those who afterwards wished to efface the scars of the numerrous rendings caused in the Church by the entrance of this insubordinate disciple, represented that he had spent a long time in Jerusalem, associating with the disciples on terms of the completest liberty; but when he began to address the hellenistic Jews, they had nearly killed him, so that the brethren, watchful for his safety, had conducted him to Cæsarea (Acts ix. 29–36).

That he went from Jerusalem to Cæsarea there may be no reason to doubt. But he did not stay there long, proceeding thence to pass through Syria, and then Cilicia (Gal. i. 21). He was, no doubt, already engaged in preaching, but quite independently, and taking counsel with no one. During this period, which we may reckon at two years,[1] he remained at Tarsus, and the churches of Cilicia may have now been founded by him.[2] But Paul's life was not, at this time, what we afterwards find it to be. He did not assume the title of apostle, which was as yet strictly confined to the Twelve; his first assertion of it is in "Galatians" (of date about 56), which seems (ii. 7–10) to imply that he received it five years earlier.[3] It was only on parting with Barnabas in 45 that he entered on that course of religious wandering and preaching which has made him the type of the travelling missionary.

[1] Acts ix. 30; xi. 25; Gal. i. 18; ii. 4 (the clearest date of time).

[2] Acts xv. 23, 41. Cilicia had a church in 51.

[3] He does subscribe himself as apostle in First and Second Thessalonians, which are of date 53; the use of the word in 1 Thess. ii. 6 is unofficial. Paul is never called an apostle by the writer of Acts: the use in xiv. 4, 14 is exceptional.

CHAPTER XII.

ANTIOCH. — A. D. 41.

STEP by step, the new faith was now making astonishing advance. Disciples from Jerusalem, scattered abroad by the death of Stephen, followed up their victories along the Phœnician coast, and as far as Cyprus and Antioch. Their appeal at first was strictly confined to Jews (Acts xi. 19).

The centre of Christianity in northern Syria was Antioch, "the metropolis of the East," and the third city of the world, next in rank after Rome and Alexandria.[1] Here was a population of more than 150,000, almost as large as that of Paris in the early part of our century,[2] and here resided the imperial legate (Governor-General) of Syria. It had been a very splendid city under the Seleucidæ, and had only gained by the Roman occupation. In general, the Greek dynasty was in advance of the Roman in the art of the theatrical decoration of great cities, — temples, aqueducts, baths, and courts of justice; nothing lacked to Antioch of what was needed to make a great Syrian capital of the period. The streets were lined with colonnades, and the open spaces were decorated with statues, with greater symmetry

[1] Jos. *War*, iii. 2: 4; Strabo, xvi. 2: 5.

[2] Otfried Müller, *Antiq. Antioch.* (Göttingen, 1839), 68. Chrysostom, *In S. Ignat.* 4; *In Matt.* (hom. 85: 4), reckons the population of Antioch at 200,000, omitting slaves, children, and the wide suburbs. At present it contains about 12,000.

and regularity than elsewhere; similar features in Palmyra, Gerasa, Gadara, and Sebaste being probably imitated from the grand *Corso* of Antioch. This Corso, with four ranges of columns, forming two sheltered arcades with a broad avenue between, traversed the city from side to side,[1] a length of thirty-six stadia (nearly four and a half miles). Besides these vast constructions for public convenience, Antioch could boast of what few Syrian towns possessed, — masterpieces of Greek art, admirable statues, classic works executed with a refinement of skill which this age could not even imitate.[2] Since its foundation (B. C. 300), Antioch had been a purely Grecian city. The Macedonian subjects of Antigonus and Seleucus had brought into this region of the lower Orontes their most living memories, their worships, and their local names.[3] Greek mythology had created here, as it were, a second home, which displayed numerous "holy places" sacred to that mythology. Antioch was devoted to the worship of Apollo and the Nymphs. An exquisite spot called Daphne, at two hours' distance from the city, recalled to the memory of these invaders the most charming of the Greek fables. Daphne was not an original, but a copy, a counterfeit of the native myths of Greece, — like those bold importations by which primitive tribes convey from land to land their mythical geography,

[1] Traces of this splendid avenue are still found near Bâb Bolos (Paul's Gate).

[2] See Libanius, *Antioch.* 342, 344; Pausanias, vi. 2: 7; Malala, p. 201; Visconti, *Mus. Pio-Clem.* iii. 46; also, medals and coins of Antioch.

[3] Viz., Pieria, Bottia, Peneius, Tempe, Castalia, the Olympic games, Iopolis (so named for Io, mythical mother of the Ionic race). The city's fame was claimed to be due to Inachos, Orestes, Daphne, and Triptolemos.

their Berecynthian Cybele, their Arvanda, their Ida and Olympus. These Greek fables here made a very antiquated religion, hardly more serious than Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. The old religions of the country, particularly that of Mount Casius,[1] gave a slightly more sober aspect to this sham. But the Syrian levity, the Babylonish trickery, and all forms of Asiatic imposture, here mingling on the frontier of two civilisations, had made Antioch a capital of lies, a sink of every infamy.

Side by side with the Greek population, more crowded here than anywhere else in the East excepting Alexandria, Antioch always contained a large number of native Syrians, speaking Aramaic.[2] These made a lower class, living chiefly in the suburbs, or in the populous villages that made a broad belt about the capital,[3] — Charandama, Ghisira, Gandigura, Apate (mostly Syrian names).[4] Intermarriage of Syrians and Greeks was common; and this, with a decree of Seleucus that none but a citizen should live within the city, had made at Antioch, in its three-and-a-half-centuries' existence, one of the most mixed populations to be found anywhere. The degradation of character was horrible; for it is the nature of these hot-houses of moral rottenness to drag down each population to the same level. We can hardly form a notion of the degree of corruption reached by humanity at Antioch, even from the present baseness of certain cities in the

[1] See Malala, 199; Spartianus, *Adrian*, 14; Julian, Misopogon, 361, 2; Ammianus Marc. xxii. 14; Eckhel, *Doct. num. vet.* i. 3: 326; Guigniaut, *Relig. de l'Antiq.* pl. 268.

[2] Chrysost. *Ad Pop. Ant.* hom. xix. 1; *De sanct. mart.* 1 (ii. 651).

[3] Liban. 348.

[4] *Act. SS. Mail.* v. 383, 409, 414–416; Assemani, *Bib. Or.* ii. 323.

Levant, which are ruled by a spirit of intrigue, and given wholly over to schemes of low cunning. It was an untold mass of tricksters, quacks, low comedians, dealers in magic, miracle-mongers, sorcerers,[1] and impostor-priests; a town of races, games, dances, processions, holidays, and orgies; luxury unbridled, every Oriental craze; the vilest of superstitions, and a fanaticism of revel.[2] By turns fawning and ungrateful, cowardly and insolent, the people of Antioch were the perfect model of the senile mobs of Cæsarism, — men without a country, without nationality, family honour, or a name to be protected. The broad avenue that crossed the city was like a theatre, where all day long poured the ebb and flow of an idle populace, empty-headed, fickle, riotous,[3] quick-witted at times,[4] fond of street-songs, parodies, jests, and all manner of frivolities.[5] The town was much given to letters,[6] but to a mere literature of rhetoricians.[7] There were extraordinary spectacular shows: games in which bevies of dancing girls took part, barely clad in a mere waist-cloth;[8] and, at the celebrated festival of *Maiouma*, troops of public women swam about in tanks of clear

[1] Juven. *Sat.* iii. 62; Statius, *Silvæ*, i. 6: 72; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 69.

[2] Malala, 284, 287; Liban. *De ang.* 555; *De carc. vinctis*, 455; *Ad Timoc.* 385; *Antioch.* 323; Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* i. 16; Lucian, *De Salt.* 76; Diod. Sic. fr. 34: 34; Chrysost. Hom. 7 *in Matt.* 5; 73 *in Matt.* 3; *De consubst.* i. 501; *De Anna*, iv. 730; *De David*, iii. 1 (iv. 768–770); Julian, *Misop.* 343, 350 (Spanheim); *Acta S. Theklæ*, 70 (Antwerp, 1603).

[3] Philostr. *Apoll.* iii. 58; Auson. *Clar. Urb.* 2; Jul. Capitol. *Verus*, 7; *Marc. Aurel.* 25; Herodian, ii. 10; Suidas, Ἰοβιανός (*Jovian*); John of Antioch, *Exc. Val.* 884.

[4] Julian, *Misop.* 344, 365; Eunap. *Sophistæ*, 496; Amm. Marc. xxii. 14.

[5] Chrysost. *De Lazaro*, ii. 11.

[6] Cic. *Pro Arch.* 3.

[7] Philostr. *Vit. Apoll.* iii. 58.

[8] Malala, 287–289.

water.[1] It was like a drunken revel, a dream of Sardanapalus, into which every indulgence, every form of debauch plunged pell-mell, not without a certain restraint of elegance. Here was the chief source of that river of filth which (says Juvenal) poured forth from the Orontes to deluge Rome.[2] Two hundred special officers (*decuriones*) had it in charge to regulate the ceremonies and festal shows.[3] The civil administration held vast public domains, whose revenue was divided by *duumvirs* among the poorer citizens.[4] Like every great pleasure-resort, Antioch had its wretched lowest class, living from public dole or sordid gain.

That this seat of moral depravation did not quite degenerate into mere brutish ugliness was due to the infinite charm of nature and the beauty of its works of art. The situation of Antioch is one of the loveliest in the world. The city occupied the space between the Orontes and the slopes of Mount Silpius, a spur of the Casian range. The abundance and beauty of its waters had no equal.[5] The city-wall, which climbs steep cliffs by a true marvel of military engineering,[6] embraced the mountain summit, and, with rocky peaks of vast height, made a sculptured coronet wondrously impressive. This arrangement of the defences, combining the advantages of the old hill-city (*acropolis*) with those of a great fortified town, was a favourite one among the

[1] Liban. *Antioch.* 355, 356.

[2] Juv. *Sat.* iii. 62; see the Latin lexicon under *ambubaia*, the name of a class of Syrian girls in Rome (the word *ambuba* is Syriac).

[3] Liban. *Antioch.* 315; *De carc. vinct.* 455; Julian, *Misop.* 367.

[4] Liban. *Pro rhet.* 211; *Antioch.* 303.

[5] Liban. *Antioch.* 354.

[6] The same feature is still visible, as in the time of Justinian, when the wall was built.

generals of Alexander, as we see at Seleucia (of Pieria), Ephesus, Smyrna, and Thessalonica (*Salonica*). It gave the opportunity of astonishing prospects. Antioch held within its walls elevations of more than seven hundred feet, cliffs and torrents, precipices and deep gorges, cascades and grots almost inaccessible, and, amid all these, delicious gardens.[1] A heavy thicket of myrtle, flowering shrubs, laurel, evergreens of the tenderest hue, rocks draped with carnation, hyacinth, and cyclamen, give to these rude heights the aspect of hanging flowerbeds. The variety of flowers, the bright-green turf, made up of innumerable delicate grasses, and the beauty of the plane-trees along the river brink, fill the heart with gaiety, and the air with that soft fragrance which intoxicated the high genius of Chrysostom, Libanius, and the emperor Julian. On the right bank of the Orontes spreads a broad plain, bounded on one side by the mountain range of Amanus, and the strange irregular peaks of Pieria, and on the other by the tableland of Cyrrhestice,[2] beyond which lies the dangerous presence of Arabia and the desert. The valley of the Orontes, opening to the west, puts this inland basin in touch with the sea, or rather, with the vast Western world, in the heart of which the Mediterranean has always made a sort of neutral highway, or bond of federation.

Among the various colonies attracted by the liberal policy of the Seleucids to the Syrian capital, the Jewish was one of the most numerous.[3] It dated from the

[1] Liban. 337–339.

[2] The lake *Ak-Deniz*, which now limits the district of *Antakieh*, did not exist, apparently, in antiquity: Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvii. 1149, 1613.

[3] Jos. *Ant.* xii. 3 : 1; xiv. 12 : 6; *War*, ii. 18; vii. 3 : 2–4.

time of Seleucus Nicator (B. C. 316–280), and held the same rights with the Greeks.[1] Though the Jews had a governor (*ethnarch*) of their own, their relations with the pagans were very frequent. Here, as at Alexandria, these relations often came to contentions and aggressions,[2] and on the other hand gave opportunity for an active religious propaganda. The official polytheism became more and more unsatisfying to serious minds; and thus many, who were disaffected to the vain pomps of paganism, were drawn to the Greek philosophy or to Judaism. The number of proselytes was large. In the early years of Christianity, Antioch had given to the church at Jerusalem one of its most influential men, Nicolas, one of its deacons (Acts vi. 5). Here were excellent germs, waiting only till a ray of grace should make them bud forth and yield nobler fruit than had yet been seen.

The church at Antioch was founded by a few believers, natives of Cyprus, who had already been active in the work of conversion (Acts xix. 19–21). Hitherto they had addressed only Jews. But in a city where pure Jews, Jewish proselytes, "men fearing God" (half-Jews), and pure pagans lived together on common terms,[3] little addresses limited to a group of houses could not subsist. The feeling of religious aristocracy which inflated the Jews of Jerusalem with pride did not exist in these great cities of a civilisation purely pagan, where the horizon was wide and prejudice had no deep root. The missionaries from Cyprus and Cyrene were accordingly brought to depart from their rule, and to preach alike to Jews and Greeks.

[1] Jos. *C. Apion*, ii. 4; *War*, vii. 3:3, 4; 5:2.
[2] Malala, 244, 245; Jos. *War*, vii. 5:2.
[3] Jos. *War*, ii. 18:2.

The relations between the Jewish and pagan population seem at this time to have been very bad.[1] But the new views were promoted by circumstances of another sort. The earthquake which had severely damaged the city (March 23, 37) still occupied men's thoughts. All the town talk was of a pretender named Debborius, who claimed the power to prevent such disasters by ridiculous charms;[2] and this may have kept the common mind still bent towards supernatural events. However that may be, the success of the Christian preaching was very great. A young church was soon founded, ardent, innovating, full of the future, because it was made up of the most diverse elements. All the gifts of the Spirit were widely diffused, and it was already easy to foresee that this new church, freed from the narrow Mosaism which drew an impassable line about Jerusalem, would be a second cradle of Christianity. Jerusalem, it may be, will forever remain the religious capital of the world; but Antioch was the starting-point of the gentile church, the first home of Christian missions. Here for the first time was established a Christian church wholly disengaged from Judaism; here was founded the grand propaganda of the apostolic age; here Saint Paul came to his perfect growth. Antioch forms the second stage in the advance of Christianity. In respect of the nobility of its Christian attitude, neither Rome, nor Alexandria, nor Constantinople can be compared with it.

The topography of old Antioch is so far effaced that

[1] Malala (245), whose account, however, does not agree with that of Josephus.

[2] Malala, 243, 265; comp. *Comptes rendus de l'Acad. des Inscr.* Aug. 1865.

we should look in vain, on a soil almost void of any trace of antiquity, for the spot to which so many grand memories cling. Here, as everywhere, Christianity had to plant itself in the poorer quarters, among people of petty trades. The church that in the fourth century was called "ancient" and "apostolic" stood in the street called *Singon*, near the Pantheon;[1] but where this was, we do not know. Tradition, with some vague hints of resemblance, would incline us to seek the original Christian quarter somewhere near the gate which still bears the name of Paul (*Bâb Bolos*),[2] or at the foot of the eminence called by Procopius *Staurinen* (hill of the Cross), southeastward of the ramparts, on the opposite quarter of the city from that now occupied. This was a quarter among the poorest in pagan monuments, but it still contains ruins of old sanctuaries dedicated to Peter, Paul, and John. Here Christianity seems to have endured longest, after the Mahometan conquest; here, too, was the "quarter of the saints," as opposed to the pagan city. Here the rock is honeycombed with grots which look as if they may have been the abode of anchorites. The steep rocky slopes hereabout, where in the fourth century divers pillar-saints — disciples at once of India and Galilee, of Jesus and of Buddha — looked down in scorn from the summit of their pillars or from their flowery dens upon the pleasure-loving city, are probably not far from the dwelling-place of Peter and of Paul. The church at Antioch has a more connected history, with fewer

[1] Malala, 242; Athanasius, i. 771; Chrysost. *Ad. pop. Ant.*; *In inscr. Act.* iii. 60; *Chron. pasch.* 296; Theodoret, ii. 27; iii. 2, 8, 9; the term "ancient" does not here apply to the city.

[2] Pococke, *Descr.* 192; Chesney, *Exped.* i. 425.

fables, than any other. There may be some value in the Christian tradition of a city where Christianity had such continuity and vigour.

The dominant language of this church was Greek, though many of its members were probably from the Syriac-speaking suburbs. Thus Antioch already contained the germs of two rival and at length hostile churches; the Grecian part being that now represented by the Greeks of Syria, both "orthodox" and "catholic," while the other may be said still to exist in the Maronites, who once spoke Syriac, and now retain it as their sacred tongue. These Maronites, under their wholly modern "catholicity," conceal a remote antiquity; and are probably the last descendants of the Syrians before the days of Seleucus, and of those suburban dwellers (*pagani*) of Ghisira, Charandama, etc.,[1] who very early set up their separate church, were persecuted as heretics by "orthodox" emperors, and took refuge in the Lebanon, where, partly from hatred to the Greek church, partly from some deeper affinity,[2] they made alliance with the Latins.

The Jewish converts at Antioch were also very numerous (Acts xi. 19, 20; xiii. 1); but we may suppose (as implied in Gal. ii. 11–13) that they at once accepted fellowship with the Gentiles. Thus the generous thought of Jesus as to a religious brotherhood of races — foreshadowed, let us rather say, by six centuries of prophecy — became a reality at length upon the borders of the Orontes.

[1] The Maronite type is found, strikingly marked, throughout the vicinity of Antakieh, Souehdieh, and Beylan.

[2] Naironi, *Euoplia* (Rome, 1694), 58; Paul-Peter Masad, the present patriarch of the Maronites, in a work entitled *Kitâb ed-durr el-manzoum* (Arabic, printed at the monastery of Tamish in Kesrouan, 1863).

CHAPTER XIII.

BARNABAS; A MISSION TO THE GENTILES — A. D. 42–44.

When the tidings reached Jerusalem of what had taken place at Antioch, the stir was great (Acts xi. 22–30). Some of the leading members of the church here, especially Peter, were of a better mind; but the apostolic group continued to be beset with the paltriest ideas. Signs of dissatisfaction were manifest among some of the elders, as soon as it was learned that the good news had been declared to pagans. Barnabas was the man who now suppressed this wretched jealousy, and saved the future of Christianity from the ruin that threatened it from the exclusive policy of the "Hebrews." Barnabas was the most enlightened spirit in the church at Jerusalem, head of the liberal party, which insisted on progress and a church open to all. He had already aided powerfully to allay the distrust that had risen up against Paul. At this time again his great influence was felt. He was sent to Antioch as delegate of the apostolic body; he saw and approved all that had there been done, and declared openly that the Church had only to go on in the way now open before it. Conversions continued to be numerous (*id.* xi. 22–24). The living and creative power of the Church seems to gather itself up at Antioch. Barnabas, whose zeal chose always to be at the point of warmest action, remained there. His own church was thereafter at

Antioch, and from that point went forth his most fruitful ministry. Christianity has done this great man an injustice, in not ranking him among the very foremost of its founders. Barnabas was the champion of every broad and generous idea. His clear-eyed courage was the make-weight against what might have been the fatal obstinacy of those narrow-minded Jews who formed the conservative party in Jerusalem.

A noble thought took root at Antioch in this generous soul. Paul was now at Tarsus, in a leisure that to a man of such restless activity must have been torture. His false position, his harsh temper, his exaggerated claims, were a drawback to his eminent qualities. There he stayed, almost useless, consuming his heart. Barnabas had the skill to put to its proper task that force which wasted in an unwholesome and dangerous solitude. A second time he held out his hand to Paul, and brought that ungovernable nature into the companionship of brethren whom he wished to shun. Barnabas went himself to Tarsus, where he sought out Paul and brought him to Antioch (Acts xi. 25); a thing which the old obstructionists in Jerusalem could never have done. To win this great sensitive retractile soul; to yield before the weaknesses and humours of a man of fire, singularly self-asserting; to forget one's self in preparing the most favourable field for the wayward energies of another, — this is surely the highest reach of human virtue; and this is what Barnabas did for Paul. The larger part of Paul's glory is due to this modest man who ever led the way for him, put himself aside in his presence, discovered his true value, set him in the light, more than once prevented his faults from spoiling all, and others' bigotry from driving him

into revolt, and thus parried the deadly stroke which those pitiful personalities would have dealt against the work of God.

For a whole year Barnabas and Paul were now as one man in this active companionship. It was one of the most brilliant years, and doubtless the happiest, in the life of Paul. The fruitful originality of these two great men lifted the church at Antioch to a height that none other had yet attained. The Syrian capital was one of the most wide-awake places in all the world. In the Roman imperial period, as now, social and religious questions came to the front chiefly in great populous centres. A sort of reaction against the general immorality, which afterwards made Antioch the home of pillar-saints and solitaries,[1] might already be discerned. Thus the true doctrine found here the best conditions of success that it had ever met.

One main circumstance shows that the new religion first had the full consciousness of itself at Antioch: here it first received a distinctive name. Hitherto its adherents had been known among themselves as "the believers," "the faithful," the "brethren," "the disciples;" but there was no official and public name by which they might be distinguished. At Antioch was formed the name "Christian" (Χριστιανός, Acts xi. 26). The termination (-anus) is Latin, not Greek, which seems to show that it was made by Roman authority, a police-designation, like the party-names *Herodian*, *Pompeian*, *Cæsarian*.[2] It is sure, in any case, to have

[1] Libanius, *Pro templis*, 164; *De carc.* 458; Theod. iv. 28; Chrysost. Hom. 72 *in Matt.* 3; *in Ephes.* 6:4; *in* 1 *Tim.* 14:3; Niceph. xii. 44; Glycas, 257.

[2] Compare 1 Pet. iv. 16, Jas. ii. 7, and Acts xxvi. 28, with Suet. *Nero*, 16, and Tac. *Ann*, xv. 44. The term Ἀσιανός (Acts xx. 4; Philo, *Leg.* 36;

been conferred by the pagan population; and it is founded on an error, since it supposes *Christus* (Χριστός), which is simply a translation of the Hebrew verbal *Mashia* (*Messiah*) to be a personal name.[1] Many, indeed, who had no clear notion of Jewish or Christian ideas would be led to think that *Christus* or *Chrestus* was a party leader still alive. The common pronunciation, in fact, was *Chrêstiani* (Χρηστιανοί).[2]

The Jews, at all events, did not adopt, systematically,[3] the name given by the Romans to their schismatic fellow-religionists. They continued to call them "Nazareans" or "Nazoreans,"[4] just as they had called Jesus "the Nazarene" (*Han nasri* or *Han nosri*). This name has continued in the East till now.

This is a moment of high importance. It is a solemn hour when a new creation receives its name, for this is the final testimony to its existence. From that hour the individual or the community takes selfhood, and ceases to be another. Thus the forming of the name "Christian" marks the exact date when the Church of Jesus parted company with Judaism. The two re-

Strabo, etc.), is a Latinism, like Δαλδιανοί and the sect-names Σιμωνιανοί, Κηρινθιανοί, Σηθιανοί, etc. The Greek derivative from Χριστός would be Χρίστειος. It is merely idle to derive the Latin *anus* from the Doric form of ηνος.

[1] So Tacitus and Suetonius (Claudius, 25) understand it.

[2] *Corp. inscr. gr.* 2883 *d*, 3857 *p*, 3865 *l*; Tert. *Apol.* 3; Lact. *Div. inst.* iv. 7; and the old French *Chrestien.*

[3] Jas. ii. 7 is only incidental.

[4] Nesârâ. The Syriac *meshihoio* and the Arabic *mesihi* are comparatively modern; *Galilæans* is still later, given in disparagement by Julian (Ep. 7): see Greg. Naz. *Or.* 4:76; Cyn. Alex. *C. Julianum*, 3:39; *Philopatris* (of Julian's time, not by Lucian), 12; Theod. iii. 4. In Epictetus and M. Aurelius (*Med.* xi. 3) the name does not, I think, mean the Christians, but the *sicarii*, or Zealots, followers of Judas the Gaulonite and John of Gischala (see "Antichrist").

ligions long continued to be confounded; but this was only where Christianity was (so to speak) checked in its growth. The Christian body in general promptly accepted the new name invented for it, and regarded it as a title of honour (1 Pet. iv. 16; Jas. ii. 7). When we reflect that within ten years after the death of Jesus his religion already has a Greek and a Latin name in the capital of Syria, we are astonished at its rapid progress. Christianity is now completely weaned from the the maternal bosom. The true thought of Jesus has won the day against the indecision of his first disciples. The church at Jerusalem is outgrown; Aramaic, the mother-tongue of Jesus, is unknown to many among his disciples. Christianity speaks in Greek; and it has made the final plunge into that vast whirlpool of the Greek and Roman world, from which it will part no more.

There must needs be something extraordinary in the feverish activity of thought now developed in the youthful Church. There were frequent and great manifestations of the Spirit (Acts xiii. 2). All thought themselves inspired, each in his own way: some were "prophets," others "pastors and teachers." Barnabas, the "son of consolation" had, no doubt, the rank of prophet; Paul had no special title. Among those of note in the church at Antioch we find Simeon, surnamed *Niger*, Lucius of Cyrene, Menahem (Manaen, Acts xiii. 1), foster brother of Herod Antipas, who was consequently of advanced age. All these were Jews. Among the pagan converts may have been Euodias, who seems at a later time to have held the first rank in the church at Antioch.[1] The pagans who responded to the first appeal were doubt-

[1] Euseb. *Chron.* 43; *H. E.* iii. 22; Ignat. *Ep. ad. Ant.* (apocr.) 7.

less of a lower rank; they could make small display of speaking with tongues, preaching, or prophecy.

In the midst of this overpowering companionship, Paul kept pace with the foremost. He afterwards spoke in disparagement of the "gift of tongues" (1 Cor. xiv.), and it is likely that he never practised it. But he had many visions and direct revelations. It was apparently at Antioch — though it may have been a little earlier, at Tarsus[1] — that he had the singular experience which he relates as follows: "I knew a man in Christ, who fourteen years ago — whether in the body or out of the body I know not; God knows — was caught up into the third heaven. And I know that this man — God knows whether in the body or out of the body — was caught up into paradise, where he heard unspeakable words, which it is not permitted to mortal man to utter."[2] Customarily sober and practical, Paul yet shared the ideas of his time on the supernatural. He believed that he himself wrought miracles, as everybody else did:[3] those gifts of the Spirit, which were understood (1 Cor. xii.) to be of common right in the Church, surely could not be refused to him!

But minds kindled with so hot a flame could not be tied fast to these dreams of overflowing piety. They must turn straight to action. All thinking men were now mastered by the great thought of missions designed to convert the pagan world, beginning with Asia Minor.

[1] He states it to have been 14 years before the time of his writing (2 Cor. xii. 1: written not far from A. D. 57).

[2] For Jewish ideas of the successive heavens, see *Test. of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *Levi*, 3; *Asc. of Isaiah*, vi. 13, 15; vii. 3, 8 *et seq.*; Bab. Talm. *Chagiga*, 12 *b*, 14 *b*; Midr. *Beresh. rabba*, xix. 19 *c*; *Shem. rabba*, xv. 115 *d*; *Bamm. rabba*, 24 *d*.

[3] 2 Cor. xii. 12; Rom. xv. 19.

Now, even if such a thought had come to birth in Jerusalem, it could have no fulfilment there. A great missionary work requires some investing of funds. But the church at Jerusalem was very poor in pecuniary means; all its common treasury went to the maintenance of the needy, and often was not enough for that. Contributions had to be sent in from all parts of the world, that these high-minded beggars might not die of famine.[1] Communism had created there a hopeless pauperism, and total helplessness to undertake any great thing. No such curse had befallen the church at Antioch. Jews in these pagan cities had acquired comfortable means, and sometimes great wealth;[2] and those who entered the church brought with them considerable property. Thus Antioch furnished the invested capital for the founding of Christianity. We see at once the contrast there must be, in temper and habit, between the two churches, due to this one circumstance. Jerusalem continued to be the city of "God's poor" (the *ebionim*); the home of those true-hearted Galilæan visionaries, who were heated and almost stunned by the promise of a kingdom in the heavens (Jas. ii. 5). Antioch, the city of Paul, which knew little of the word of Jesus and had never listened to it, was the headquarters of action and progress. Jerusalem was the city of the old apostolic circle, buried in its dreams, powerless in presence of the new problems that were opening up, but dazed with its peerless privilege, and rich in its inestimable memories.

All these points of contrast were suddenly brought

[1] Acts xi. 29; xxiv. 17; Gal. ii. 10; Rom. xv. 26; 1 Cor. xvi. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 14; ix. 1, 12.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 6:3, 4; xx. 5:2.

into a glare of light. The poor famished church at Jerusalem had such utter lack of foresight that the slightest chance might bring it to the last straits. Where there is no such thing as system in the handling of money, where business is still in its infancy, and the opportunities of wealth are small, famines are merely a question of time. There was a dreadful one in the fourth year of Claudius (A. D. 44).[1] When the symptoms of it began to be felt, the elders at Jerusalem bethought them of applying to their brethren in the wealthier churches of Syria; and a deputation of "prophets" came to Antioch (Acts xi. 27–30). One of them, Agabus, reputed to be a man of singular illumination, was all at once possessed by the Spirit, and foretold the scourge that would soon be felt. The faithful at Antioch were greatly touched by the woes impending over the mother-church, whose tributaries they felt themselves to be. They made up a sum, each contributing according to his means, and put it in the charge of Barnabas, to carry to the brethren in Judæa.[2] Jerusalem was still long to be the capital of Christianity; and Jerusalem had its special prerogative: it was the only seat of the apostles (Gal. i. 17–19). But a long step has been already taken. During many years there has been only one church fully organised, that at Jerusalem, absolute centre of the faith, the

[1] Acts xi. 28; xii. 20; Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2:6; Euseb. ii. 8, 12; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 43; Suet. *Claud.* 18; Dion Cassius, lx. 11; Aur. Victor, *Cæs.* 4; Eus. *Chron.* 43, 44. Local famines happened almost every year under Claudius.

[2] Acts (xi. 30; xii. 25) speaks of Paul as a fellow in this charge; but Paul implies (Gal. ii. 1) that he did not go to Jerusalem after his first two weeks' stay there, until he went, in company of Barnabas, expressly to meet the question of circumcision (see Introd. pp. 19–21).

source whence all life flows out, the home to which all life flows back. It is no longer so. Antioch has also its full-grown church, with its complete gradation of spiritual gifts, — a church whence missions set forth, and to which they return (Acts xiii. 3; xiv. 25; xv. 36; xviii. 22, 23). Antioch is now a second capital; say rather a second heart, with its own proper action, and its own power felt in every direction.

As we might easily foresee, the second capital will soon gain upon the first. The church at Jerusalem, in truth, declines rapidly. A social organisation built on communism will have one first hour of brilliant success; for communism always implies a great exaltation of the common spirit; but it must very rapidly decay, since communism is opposed by human nature. In a spasm of virtue, man thinks he can wholly renounce selfishness and personal advantage; but selfishness strikes its counter-blow by proving that entire disinterestedness engenders evils still graver than those which the abolition of property had thought to do away.

CHAPTER XIV.

PERSECUTION UNDER HEROD AGRIPPA — A. D. 44.

Barnabas found the church at Jerusalem in great distress. The year 44 was to this church a time of great calamity. Besides the famine, it beheld the kindling of a new flame of that persecution which had slackened since the death of Stephen.

Herod Agrippa, grandson of Herod the Great, had within the past three years succeeded in piecing again together his ancestral kingdom. Under favour of Caligula, he had at length reunited under his dominion Batanæa, Trachonitis, a part of Hauran, Abilene, Galilee, and Peræa.[1] His fortune was made by the base part he played in the tragi-comedy that put Claudius on the throne. The lessons of baseness and treachery which this vile Oriental had given at Rome availed to give him Samaria and Judæa, and to his brother Herod the petty royalty of Chalcis.[2] The memories he had left at Rome were of the worst, and the cruelties of Caligula were charged, in part, to his counsels.[3] He had no love from his army, or from the pagan towns Sebaste and Cæsarea, which he sacrificed to Jerusalem;[4] but to the Jews he showed himself lavish, fond of display,

[1] The indications of Josephus (Ant. xix. 4, *War*, ii. 11) are fully confirmed by inscriptions: see *Comptes rendus*, 1865, 106–109.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 5 : 1; 6 : 1; *War*, ii. 11 : 5; Dion Cassius, lx. 8.

[3] Dion Cass. lix. 24.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 9 : 1.

and with a fellow-feeling for their ills. He aimed at popularity among them, and affected a polity quite opposite to that of Herod, who had his eye more upon the Greek and Roman world than upon the little state of Judæa. Herod Agrippa, on the contrary, was fond of Jerusalem, strictly kept the Jewish Law, affected scrupulosity, and never let a day pass without performing his devotions.[1] He even accepted graciously the advice of rigourists, and took pains to defend himself against their censure.[2] To the citizens of Jerusalem he remitted payment of the house-tax.[3] In one word, the orthodox found in him a king after their own heart.

From a ruler of this quality it was inevitable that the Christians should suffer persecution. Sincere or not, Herod Agrippa was a Jewish sovereign in the full meaning of the term.[4] As the Herodian house grew weak, it turned to devotion. The broadly pagan thought of the founder of that royal house — who aspired to group the most diverse creeds in one political life, under the empire of a common civilisation — was no longer to be found. When Herod Agrippa, as king, first set foot in Alexandria, he was received as "King of the Jews," a title which irritated the populace, and drew upon him evil jests without end.[5] What, indeed, could a king of the Jews be, if not a protector of the Law and its traditions, a theocratic and persecuting sovereign? From the time of the first Herod, under whom fanaticism was thoroughly held down, until the outburst of the war that brought the downfall

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 6 : 1, 3; 7 : 3, 4; 8 : 2; 9 : 1.
[2] *Ibid.* xix. 7 : 4.
[3] *Ibid.* xix. 6 : 3.
[4] Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 158, 159; Persius, *Sat.* v. 180.
[5] Philo, *In Flacc.* 5.

of Jerusalem, there was thus a constantly increasing growth of religious heat. The death of Caligula (Jan. 24, 41) had brought on a reaction favourable to the Jews. They were also, in general, well treated by Claudius,[1] owing to the influence with him of Herod Agrippa and his brother of Chalcis. He not only sided with the Jews of Alexandria in their quarrels with the other inhabitants, allowing them to choose their own governor (*ethnarch*); but, it is said, granted to Jews throughout the empire the same liberty to live after their own laws that had been yielded to those of Alexandria, on the sole condition of not insulting other faiths. Some attempts at renewing the vexations of Caligula's reign were suppressed.[2] Jerusalem was greatly enlarged; the region Bezetha was added.[3] The hand of Roman authority was hardly felt, though Vibius Marsus — a man of foresight, ripe in service, and of cultivated mind,[4] who had succeeded Petronius as Governor-General of Syria — now and then called attention at Rome to the peril from these half-independent royalties in the East.[5]

Something like a feudal system [of local military rule] was tending, ever since the death of Tiberius, to become fixed upon Syria and the adjacent districts;[6] this was, in truth, a check upon the imperial policy, and had, in general, very ill effects. The petty "kings" who visited Rome were persons of consequence, and their influence there was only evil. The corruption and

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 5: 2, 3; xx. 6: 3; *War*, ii. 12: 7.
[2] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 6: 3.
[3] *Ibid.* 7: 2; *War*, ii. 11: 6; v. 4: 2; Tac. *Hist.* v. 12.
[4] Tac. *Ann.* vi. 47.
[5] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 7: 2, 8: 1; xx. 1: 1.
[6] *Ibid.* xix. 8: 1.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

degradation of the populace, especially under Caligula, was greatly aggravated by the spectacle offered by these wretches, who were seen, one after another, trailing their purple at the theatre, in the imperial palace, or in the prisons.[1] As to the Jews themselves, we have already seen (pp. 143, 165, 177) that autonomy meant intolerance. The high-priesthood went out of the family of Hanan only at intervals, to fall into that of Boëthus, which was just as insolent and cruel. A sovereign ruler anxious to please the Jews could not fail to grant them what they wanted most, harsh treatment of everything that went out of the line of strictest orthodoxy.

Herod Agrippa, in fact, toward the end of his rule, became a bitter persecutor (Acts xii.). In 44, a little before the Passover, he beheaded James the son of Zebedee, brother of John, one of the chief members of the apostolic circle. This was not brought up as a matter of religion; there was no investigation before the Sanhedrim; the sentence was given by the king's purely arbitrary authority, as in the case of John the Baptist: James indeed was beheaded, not stoned. Encouraged by the applause of the Jews, Herod now thought to advance further in so easy a path of popularity (Acts xii. 3). It was in the early days of the Passover festival, when there was commonly a great access of fanaticism. Agrippa ordered Peter to be confined in the tower Antonia, intending to have him sentenced and put to death, with great display, in view of the multitudes then gathered in Jerusalem.

An incident not intelligible to us, and then supposed

[1] Suet. *Caius*, 22, 26, 35; Dion Cass. lix. 24; lx. 8; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 8. As a specimen of these petty kings, see Josephus (*Ant.* xviii., xix.) on Herod Agrippa, and Hor. *Sat.* i. 7.

to be miraculous, opened the prison-door to Peter. One evening, when many of the disciples were met at the house of Mary the mother of Mark, which was Peter's usual abode, a sudden knocking was heard at the door. A maid-servant, who went to listen, recognised Peter's voice. Beside herself with joy, she did not open, but ran in to report that he was there. They thought her crazy, but she vowed that it was true. "Then it is his angel," said some. The knocking was repeated, and behold, it was even he. The delight was boundless. Peter at once explained his deliverance to James the Lord's brother and to the rest. It was believed that the angel of God had entered the prison, and broken down the chains and bolts. Peter's story was, in fact, that all this had happened while he was in a sort of trance; that after he had passed the first and second guard, and crossed the iron door which opened to the city, the angel had gone with him a street's length, and then left him; that he then came to himself, and recognised the hand of God, who had sent a messenger from heaven to his rescue.[1]

Herod Agrippa did not long survive these acts of violence.[2] In the course of A. D. 44, he went to Cæsarea, to celebrate games in honour of Claudius. There was an extraordinary throng. The people of Tyre and Sidon, who had difficulties with Herod, came to ask mercy of him. Such festivals were very odious to the Jews, as being given in the pagan capital Cæsarea, and because they made a public show in the theatre. Once before, when the king had left Jerusalem under

[1] Acts xii. 9–11. This account is so living and precise that it is hard to find room in it for the slow growth of legend.

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 8: 2; Acts xx. 18–23.

like circumstances, a certain Rabbi Simeon had proposed to declare him outcast from Judaism and exclude him from the Temple; and the king had stooped so far as to set the rabbi at his own side in the theatre, so as to convince him that nothing was done there contrary to the Law.[1] Thinking that he had thus satisfied the formalists, Herod now freely indulged his taste for pagan displays. On the second day of the festival, he entered the theatre very early, attired in a garment of silver cloth, marvellously brilliant. The effect of this dazzling tunic in the splendour of the rising sun was prodigious. The Sidonians about the king lavished upon him adulations that had the full stamp of paganism: "This is a god," cried they, "and not a man!" The king showed no indignation, and did not blame the cry. He died five days after, — Jews and Christians alike believing that he was stricken for not having repelled with horror the blasphemous flattery. The Christian tradition had it that he died of a disease specially reserved for the enemies of God, being "eaten of worms."[2] As told by Josephus, the symptoms would seem due rather to poison; and this view might be confirmed by what is said (Acts xii. 20) of the suspicious course of the Phœnicians, in taking pains to win the favour of Blastos, the king's chamberlain.

The death of Herod Agrippa put an end to all self-government in Jerusalem. Once more the city began to be ruled by the imperial governor (*procurator*), and this state of things lasted till the great revolt [24 years]. It was a fortunate thing for Christianity; for,

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 7: 4.

[2] Acts xii. 23; see 2 Macc. ix. 9; Jos. *War*, i. 33: 5; Bab. Talm., *Sota*, 35 *a*.

remarkable as it may seem, this religion, which later was to undergo so dreadful a conflict with the Roman Empire, grew to its strength under the shadow and protection of the imperial system. For it was Rome, as I have several times remarked, that held back Judaism from giving full sweep to its instincts of intolerance, and thus smothering the free growth of what was germinating in its own bosom. Any check put upon Jewish authority was a gain to the growing sect. Cuspius Fadus, the first of this new line of governors, was another Pilate, resolute or at least favourably disposed. But Claudius continued to show his indulgence for Jewish pretensions, chiefly under the influence of Herod Agrippa the younger, son of the former, whom he kept near him and made a friend.[1] After the short term in office of Cuspius Fadus, the administration was intrusted to a Jew, Tiberius Alexander, a nephew of Philo, and son of the prefect ["alabarch," or overseer of the Arab district] of Jews in Alexandria, who attained high offices, and played a great part in the political affairs of the century. It is true that the Jews had no liking for him, and, not without reason, regarded him as an apostate.[2]

To stop short these ever-recurring disputes, recourse was had to a well-judged expedient, the partial severing of the temporal from the spiritual domain. The political power remained with the procurator; while Herod king of Chalcis, brother of the elder Agrippa, was appointed prefect of the Temple, keeper of the pon-

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 6: 1; xx. 1: 1, 2.

[2] *Ibid.* xx. 5: 2; *War*, ii. 15: 1; 18: 7; iv. 10: 6; v. 1: 6; Tac. *Ann.* xv. 28; *Hist.* i. 11, ii. 79; Suet. *Vesp.* 6; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 4957; iii. 311; also, "Antichrist," *pass.*

tifical robes, and treasurer of the sacred chest, with the right of nominating the high-priest.[1] At his death in 48, the young Herod Agrippa succeeded his uncle in these trusts, which he retained until the great war. In all this, Claudius showed himself full of good-will. The higher Roman officials in Syria, though less disposed to concession than the emperor, also displayed much moderation. The procurator Ventidius Cumanus yielded so far as to behead, in the presence of an armed line of Jews, a soldier who had torn up a copy of the Pentateuch.[2] It was all in vain; and the historian has good reason for dating from the administration of Cumanus the disorders that led to the destruction of Jerusalem.

In these troubles, to judge from the silence of Josephus, Christianity had no part. But, like Christianity itself, these very troubles were a symptom of the extraordinary fever then consuming the Jewish people, and of the Divine task then being fulfilled within it. Jewish faith had never made such progress.[3] There was no sanctuary in all the world whose fame was spread more widely, or where more offerings were made, than the Temple at Jerusalem.[4] In many portions of Syria Judaism had become the prevailing religion. The Asmonæan kings had here violently converted entire populations, — Idumæans, Ituræans, and others.[5] In many cases circumcision had been forcibly imposed.[6]

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 1 : 3.

[2] *Ibid.* xx. 5: 4; *War*, ii. 12: 2.

[3] Jos. C. *Apion*, ii. 39; Dion Cass. lxvi. 4.

[4] Jos. *War*, iv. 4: 3; v. 13 : 6; Suet. *Aug.* 93; Strabo, xvi. 2 : 34, 37; Tac. *Hist.* v. 5.

[5] Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 9: 1; 11: 3; 15: 4; xv. 7: 9.

[6] *Id. War*, ii. 17: 10; *Life*, 23.

There was great zeal in making proselytes (Matt. xxiii. 13); and in this work the Herods powerfully helped. Princes of petty dynasties, from Emesa, Pontus, and Cilicia, vassals of the Romans, became Jews, in order to marry princesses of the immensely wealthy Herodian house.[1] A great number of converts were also found in Arabia and Ethiopia. The royal families of Mesene and Adiabene, tributary to the Parthians, were also won over, especially through the women.[2] It was a common belief that good fortune followed the knowledge and practice of the Law.[3] Even without circumcision, one's religion was more or less modified in the direction of Judaism, so that religion in Syria was coming to be a form of monotheism. At Damascus, a city of no Israelite antecedents, almost all the women had embraced the Jewish faith.[4] Thus, back of Pharisaic Judaism, was growing up a sort of free Judaism, of less firm temper, ignorant of many secrets of the sect,[5] not only well inclined and bringing to it a friendly disposition, but having before it a much larger future. In some respects the situation was like that of Catholicism in our day, which shows us, on one side, haughty and narrow-minded theologians, who of themselves would gain over no more souls to Catholicism than the Pharisees did to Judaism; and on the other, a pious laity, steeped in heresy without suspecting it, but full of a touching zeal, rich in good works and emotional piety, painstaking to keep out of sight, or plausibly explain away, the errors of their instructors.

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 7: 1, 3; comp. xvi. 7: 6.
[2] *Ibid.* xx. 2: 4.
[3] *Ibid.* xx. 2: 5, 6; 4: 1.
[4] Jos. *War*, ii. 20: 2.
[5] Sen. *fragm.* in Augustine, *De Civ. Dei*, vi. 11.

One of the most singular examples of the tendency which drew pious souls toward Judaism was that given by the royal family of Adiabene, on the Tigris.[1] This house, Persian in origin and character,[2] and partly educated in Greek learning,[3] became almost wholly Jewish, and even conspicuously devout, — these proselytes, as I have said, being often more pious than native Jews. The head of this house, Izates, embraced Judaism at the preaching of one Ananias, a Jewish trader, who had found his way in his petty trade, into the palace of Abennerig, king of Mesene, where he converted all the women and became their spiritual instructor, and through them came to the knowledge of Izates. At the same time his mother Helen received instruction in the true religion from another Jew. Izates, with the zeal of a new convert, wished to undergo circumcision, but was warmly dissuaded by his mother and Ananias, who convinced him that to obey the Divine commandments (the moral law) was far more important than circumcision, and that one could be a very good Jew without that ceremony. Such tolerance was found among a small number of enlightened spirits. Some time after, a Jew of Galilee named Eleazar chanced to find the king reading the Pentateuch, and proved to him by chapter and verse that he could not keep the Law without circumcision, which Izates ordered to be performed on the spot.[4]

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2–4.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xii. 13, 14. Most of the names are Persian.

[3] As shown by the Greek name "Helen." It is, however, to be noted that Greek does not appear in an inscription (Syriac and Syro-Chaldaic) on the tomb of a princess of this house, found and brought to Paris by M. Saulcy (*Journ. Asiat.*, Dec. 1865).

[4] Comp. *Bereshith rabba*, xlvi. 51 *d*.

The conversion of Izates was followed by that of his brother Monobazes and almost all the family. In A. D. 44 Helen came to live at Jerusalem, where she built a palace and family mausoleum (still existing,[1] and was greatly beloved among the Jews from her affability and her charities. It was wonderfully edifying to see her, as a devout Jewess, attending at the Temple, consulting the doctors, reading the Law, and instructing her sons therein. In the pestilence of 44, this pious lady was the good angel of the city, making large purchases of wheat from Egypt and of dried figs from Cyprus. Izates also sent considerable sums for distribution to the poor; and the wealth of Adiabene was in part dispensed at Jerusalem, whither his sons went to learn the Jewish language and customs. Thus the entire family became a source of supply to this population of beggars. This family had acquired something like the freedom of the city, several of its members were there during the siege under Titus,[2] and others appear in the Talmudic books as models of piety and disinterestedness.[3]

It is thus that the royal family of Adiabene has its place in Christian history. Though not itself Christian, as some traditions have made it out,[4] it exhibited in various ways "the first-fruits of the gentiles." In embracing Judaism, it acted under the same impulse

[1] Now known, apparently, as "the Kings' tomb" (*Journ. Asiat.*, Dec. 1865).

[2] Jos. *War*, ii. 19 : 2; vi. 6 : 4.

[3] Jerus. Talm. *Peah*, 15 *b*, where maxims wholly like those in the gospels (Matt. vi. 19–28) are ascribed to a Monobazes; Bab. Talm. *Baba Bathra*, 11 *a*; *Joma*, 37 *a*; *Nazir*, 19 *b*; *Shabbath*, 68 *b*; Sifra, 70 *a*; *Beresh. rabba*, xlvi. 51 *d*.

[4] Moses of Khorene [an Armenian theologian of the fifth century], ii. 35; Orosius, vii. 6.

which was to bring the whole pagan world to Christianity. The true "Israel of God" was to be found far rather among these strangers, animated by a religious emotion so deeply sincere, than in the arrogant and jealous Pharisee, whose religion was only a pretext for enmity and scorn. These good proselytes were truly devout, and were therefore no fanatics, admitting as they did that true religion may be found under the most various civil codes, and thus completely separating religion from politics. The distinction between the seditious sectaries who in the next generation were to defend Jerusalem with fury, and those peaceful devotees who were to "flee to the mountains" (Luke xxi. 21) was widening every day.

We see, at all events, that proselytism was coming to be an urgent question for both Judaism and Christianity, in much the same way. Both felt the same need of widening the door of entrance. To those who took this point of view circumcision was a practice useless or even harmful; the Mosaic observances were simply a designation of descent, of value only to the sons of Abraham. Before it could become a universal faith, Judaism must be simply a form of theism, requiring only the duties of natural religion. Herein was a sublime mission to fulfil; and this view was accepted with clear intelligence, early in the first century, by a party among the Jews themselves. On the one hand, Judaism was held to be one of the numberless national cults[1] which then filled the world; and the reverence paid to it was due only to its founders having worshipped God in that way. On the other hand, it was held to be the one absolute

[1] Τὰ πάτρια ἔθη is the expression Josephus uses in defending the position of the Jews in the pagan world.

religion, made for all and destined to be adopted by all. That frightful outburst of fanaticism which got the upperhand in Judæa and brought about the war of extermination, cut that future short. Christianity then took in hand the task which the Synagogue had failed to accomplish. Putting aside all questions of ritual, it continued the purely monotheist propaganda which Judaism had abandoned. What had made the success of Judaism among the women of Damascus, in the palace of Abennerig, with the princess Helen and so many pious proselytes, made the strength of Christianity throughout the world. In this sense, the true glory is blended with that of the other, and indistinguishable from it. A generation of fanatics had deprived Judaism of its just reward, and prevented it from gathering the harvest for which it had sown the seed.

CHAPTER XV.

SIMON OF GITTON (SIMON MAGUS). — A. D. 45.

CHRISTIANITY has now really gained a firm foothold in the world. In the history of a religion only its earliest years are seriously critical. When the faith has once withstood the hard trials which lie in wait for every new undertaking, its future is assured. The founders of Christianity were more capable than the other religious leaders of the time, — Essenes, Baptists, or partisans of Judas the Gaulonite, — who did not part from the Jewish world, and perished with it; and, with a rare certainty of aim, they very early threw themselves into the great world, taking their part and lot in it. We should not wonder at the slight mention we find of the Christians in Josephus, the Talmud, or the Greek and Latin writers. Josephus has come to us through Christian copyists, who suppressed everything discreditable to their own doctrine; but we may take for granted that he spoke more at length of Jesus and the Christians than his writings in their present form give evidence. The Talmud (of which no manuscript copy has come down) likewise underwent, during the Middle Age and at the time of its first publication, much abridgment and alteration; for Christian censorship was severely practised upon the text, and numbers of wretched Jews were burned for having in their possession a book containing passages deemed blasphemous. It is no wonder that

Greek and Latin writers spent little thought upon a movement which they could noway comprehend, and which went on in a little district quite shut out from their sight. To their eyes Christianity was wholly hidden in the obscure depth of Judaism; what use in busying themselves with a family quarrel in the bosom of an abject people? The two or three passages in which Tacitus and Suetonius speak of the Christians show that the new sect, though mostly outside the horizon visible to the great public, was yet a fact of some importance; indeed, through one or two chance breaks in the mist of general inattention we have glimpses of it quite distinctly traced.

Another circumstance has helped to blur the outline of Christianity in the story of the Jewish world during the first Christian century: there is no such thing as an isolated event. At the time we have now reached Philo had just finished a life wholly devoted to the love of good. The sect of Judas the Gaulonite still survived. The successors of this agitator in his scheme were his sons James, Simon, and Menahem; of whom James and Simon were crucified by order of the renegade administrator Tiberius Alexander;[1] while Menahem was reserved to play an important part in the final tragedy of his nation.[2] In the year 44 there arose an enthusiast named Theudas,[3] who announced an impending deliverance, called on crowds to follow him into the desert, and promised that he would lead them, like another Joshua, across the Jordan dry-shod: this passage, he said, would

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 5: 2.

[2] *Id. War*, ii. 17: 8–10; *Life*, 5.

[3] How nearly both these movements came in touch with Christianity we see in Acts v. 36, 37.

be the true baptism, which should initiate each of his followers into the kingdom of heaven. More than four hundred followed him; but being pursued by cavalry sent against him by Cuspius Fadus, he was killed, and his troops were scattered.[1] A few years before, all Samaria was stirred by the voice of an enthusiast who claimed to have had a revelation of the spot on Gerizim where Moses had hidden the sacred vessels for worship; but the movement was put down with great severity by Pilate.[2] For Jerusalem the day of peace was past. After the coming of Ventidius Cumanus (in 48), there was no suspension of troubles. Excitement went so far that life there became intolerable; an explosion might happen from the slightest cause.[3] There was felt a strange disturbance, a sort of mysterious trouble. Impostors abounded everywhere.[4] The awful scourge of Zealots (*kenaïm*) or Assassins (*sicarii*) began to be felt. Wretches armed with daggers would make their way into a crowd, strike down their victims, and then be the first to cry murder. Not a day would pass without the rumour of some such act of violence. Extreme terror spread abroad. Josephus speaks of the crimes of Zealots as deeds of mere depravity;[5] but, unquestionably, fanaticism had a share in them.[6] It was to defend the Law that these wretches took the dagger. If any one failed, in their eyes, to meet every prescription of the Law, his sentence was pronounced and executed on the spot. It

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 5: 1; Acts v. 36 (note the anachronism).
[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 4: 1, 2.
[3] *Ibid.* xx. 5: 3, 4; *War*, ii. 12: 1, 2; Tac. *Ann.* xii. 54.
[4] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8: 5.
[5] *Ibid.* xx. 5: 8; *War*, ii. 13: 3.
[6] *Id. War*, vii. 8: 1; Mishna, *Sanhedrin*, ix. 6.

was thus these men thought to perform the deed of highest merit, and most pleasing to God.

Like schemes to those of Theudas were everywhere revived. Persons claiming to be inspired stirred up the people and drew them into the desert, promising to show them by manifest signs that God would deliver them. Dupes of these agitators, by the thousand, were slaughtered by the Roman authorities.[1] An Egyptian Jew, who came to Jerusalem in 56, had the skill, by his tricks, to draw away after him thirty thousand followers, four thousand of them armed with swords. From the desert he proposed to lead them upon the Mount of Olives, that from there they might see the walls of Jerusalem fall at his sole word. Felix, then procurator, marched against him and dispersed his troop; when he ran away, and never reappeared.[2] But as ill follows ill in a diseased body, it was not long before various companies made up of magicians and robbers openly led on the people to revolt afresh against the Romans, threatening with death those who continued obedient. With this pretext, they slew the rich, plundered their goods, burned the towns, and filled all Judæa with the traces of their fury.[3] Dread of a frightful war was in the air. A sort of dizziness prevailed on every side, and kept men's minds in a state not far from frenzy.

It is quite possible that Theudas may have entertained in all this some thought of a career like that of Jesus and John the Baptist. Such a thought is, at any rate, to be clearly traced in Simon of Gitton [better

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8: 6, 10; *War*, ii. 13: 4.
[2] *Id. Ant.* xx. 8: 6; *War*, ii. 13: 5; Acts xxi. 38.
[3] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 8: 6; *War*, ii. 13: 6.

known as Simon Magus], if the Christian traditions of him deserve a hearing. We have already (chap. ix.) met him in communication with the apostle on occasion of Philip's first mission in Samaria. This man became notorious in the time of Claudius.[1] His miracles were held to be established facts, and every one in Samaria regarded him as a man inspired (Acts viii. 10).

Furthermore, Simon's miracles were not the only ground of his reputation. There was besides, it seems, a doctrine, of which we cannot easily judge: a work said to be his, but known to us only in fragments, called "the great Declaration" (*exposition*), was probably a very qualified expression of his ideas. It is probably not wholly supposititious, however, considering the harmony of the system it indicates with what little we learn from Acts of Simon's doctrine of "divine powers." During his stay at Alexandria,[2] he seems to have derived from his reading in Greek philosophy an eclectic system of theosophy and allegorical exegesis like that of Philo, not wholly without claim to respect. Sometimes it reminds us of the Jewish *Kabbala*, sometimes of the pantheistic theories of Indian philosophy; in parts, it seems to bear the stamp of buddhism and parsism.[3] Above all existences is "He who is and was and will be,"[4] i. e., the Samaritan *Jahveh*, understood

[1] Justin, *Apol.* i. 26, 56. It is singular that Josephus, so well informed as to matters in Samaria, says nothing of him.

[2] Clementine Homilies, ii. 22, 24.

[3] Justin, *Ap.* i. 26, 56; ii. 15; *Tryph.* 120; Iren. i. 23:2, 5; 27:4; ii. *præf.*: Clem. *hom.* i. 15; ii. 22, 25; *Recogn.* i. 72; ii. 7; iii. 47; *Philos.* iv. 7; vi. 1; x. 4; Epiph. xxi.; Orig. *C. Cels.* v. 62; vi. 11; Tert. *De an.* 34; Const. apost. vi. 16; Jer. *In Matt.* xxiv. 5; Theod. *hær. fab.* i. 1. The best idea of the "Great Declaration" is had from citations in the *Philos.* (Hippolytus), not from the travesties found in other Church fathers.

[4] *Philosophumena*, iv. 7; vi. 1, 9, 12, 13, 17, 18; comp. Rev. i. 4, 8; iv. 8; xi. 17.

from its etymological meaning as the One Eternal, self-created, self-developed, self-seeking, and self-finding, as Father, Mother, Sister, Wife, Son.[1] In the bosom of this Infinite all things potentially exist; all passes into act and actuality through human consciousness, reason, language, and science. The universe is explained as a hierarchy of abstract principles, like the Gnostic *œons* and the mystic tree (*sephiroth*) of the Kabbala; or else as an angelic hierarchy borrowed from the Persian doctrine. Sometimes these abstractions are given out as deductions from physical or physiological facts. Again, the "divine powers," considered separately, are realized in successive incarnations, feminine or masculine, the aim of all being the deliverance of creatures confined in the bonds of matter. The first of these is called, distinctively, "the Great Power," which is the universal Providence, the intelligence of this sphere.[2] This being masculine, Simon was regarded as its incarnation. "The Great Thought" is its feminine partner, to which Simon (or the system that represents him), in his habit of symbol and allegory, gave the name *Helena*, to signify that it is everywhere sought, always the source of contention, taking vengeance on its foes by making them blind [like the fabled poet Stesichorus, of Himera], until they consent to chant a recantation (*palinode*), a strange conceit, ill understood or purposely travestied by the Church Fathers, who distorted it in the most childish tales. The writer of this scheme, has, at all events, a very remarkable acquaintance with Greek literature. He maintained that, when rightly understood, the pagan writings are enough for the knowledge

[1] *Philosophumena*, vi. 1:17.

[2] Acts viii. 10; *Philos.* vi. 1:18; Clem. *hom.* ii. 22.

of all truth. His wide eclecticism embraced all the revelations, aiming to fuse them all into a single system.

The substance of this system is near akin to that of Valentinus, and to the doctrine of Divine Persons found in Philo, the Fourth Gospel, and the Targums.[1] The *Metathronos* whom the Jews set beside the Deity, almost in his very bosom, is very like this "Great Power." In the Samaritan theology we find a Great Angel, chief of the angels, and various "manifestations," or "divine virtues,"[2] like those of the Jewish *Kabbala*. In short, Simon of Gitton appears to us as a sort of theosophist, in the same group with Philo and the Cabbalists. He may, for once, have made some approach to Christianity, but surely never adopted it.

It is hard to decide whether he borrowed anything from the disciples of Jesus. If the "Declaration" is in any sense his, we must admit that at some points he anticipated Christian ideas, and at others has borrowed broadly from them.[3] He seems to have schemed an eclecticism like that afterwards put forth by Mahomet, assuming the divine mission of John and Jesus as the groundwork of his claims, and asserting some mystical relation with them. He is said to have announced that he, Simon, had appeared to the Samaritans as the Father, to the Jews in the visible crucifixion of the Son, and to the gentiles in the gift of the Holy Spirit.[4] He thus, it may seem, prepared the way for the doc-

[1] See "Life of Jesus," pp. 260–263.

[2] *Chron. Samar.* c. 10; Reland, *De Samar.* § 7; Gesenius, *Comment.* 21.

[3] In the passage given in *Philosoph.* vi. 1:16 is a quotation from the Synoptic Gospels appearing (perhaps through negligence) to be from the "Declaration."

[4] Iren. i. 23:3; *Philos.* ii. 23, 24; vi. 1:19.

trine of the Docetæ, saying that he had indeed suffered in Judæa in the person of Jesus, but the suffering was only in appearance.[1] His claim to be the very Deity, as an object of worship, was probably exaggerated by the Christians, whose only motive was to inspire hatred against him.

We see, further, that the doctrine of the "Declaration" is that of almost all the Gnostic writings. If Simon did in fact teach these theories, he is rightly named by the Church Fathers the founder of Gnosticism.[2] The authorship of the "Declaration," I think doubtful: it is, in my view, to the real doctrine of Simon what the Fourth Gospel is to that of Jesus, belonging to the early years of the second century, when the theosophic views of the Logos gained definite ascendency. What we find in germ in the Christian beliefs of A. D. 60 — to judge from Colossians (i. 15–20), which may probably have been written by Paul — may have been known to Simon, whose career we may, if we will, extend to the end of the century.

In this enigmatical person we seem, then, to find a sort of plagiarist from Christianity. Samaritans appear to have been very apt at imitation.[3] Just as they had always offered a counterpart of Jerusalemitic Judaism, so, too, they had their imitated Christianity, their gnosis, their theosophic speculations, and their Cabbala. But was Simon an imitator deserving of respect, who only failed of success; or was he an unscrupulous juggler, a humbug,[4] trading off, for popular

[1] Clem. *hom.* ii. 22; *Recogn.* ii. 14.

[2] Iren. ii. iii. (*præf.*).

[3] Epiphan. 80 : 1.

[4] As we might incline to think, from the swift declension of his sect into a school of tricksters, and a manufacture of philters and incantations (see *Philos.* vi. 1 : 20; Tert. *De anima*, 57).

repute, a patchwork of doctrine made of picked-up rags? In the view of history he thus holds the falsest of positions, walking on a tight-rope, where to hesitate is to fall; where there is no middle ground between a ridiculous tumble and a miracle of success.

We shall, at a later date, meet Simon again, and inquire into the truth of the legends of his stay at Rome. What we know is that his sect lasted into the third century,[1] having churches at Antioch and perhaps at Rome; that Menander, of Capharetæa, and Cleobius[2] continued his doctrine, or imitated his career as wonder-worker, with some hint of Jesus and his apostles. Simon and his disciples had great repute among those of like beliefs. Sects like this, — that of Dositheus is the most noted, — side by side with Christianity and more or less touched with gnosticism, appear among the Samaritans until their quasi-destruction by Justinian. This petty religion was destined to take an impression from everything that was going on about it, without producing anything quite original.

The memory of Simon Magus remained an abomination among the Christians. His processes, so much like theirs, exasperated them. The most unpardonable of crimes, in their eyes, was to have vied in success with the apostles. His prodigies, and those of his followers, were held to be the work of the devil, and the Samaritan theosophist was stigmatised as a magician (*Magus*),[3] a name of horror to the faithful. The entire

[1] *Philos.* vi. 1:20; Origen, *C. Celsum*, i. 57; vi. 11.

[2] Euseb. iv. 22; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* vii. 17; *Const. apost.* vi. 8:16; 18:1; Just. *Apol.* i. 26, 56; Iren. i. 23:5; Philos. vii. 28; Epiph. 22, 23; Theod. *hær. sab.* i. 1, 2; Tert. *De præscr.* 46; *De anima*, 50.

[3] Acts viii. 9; Iren. i. 23:1.

Christian legend of Simon is stamped with bitter hate. He was charged with the Quietist heresy, and with the extravagances commonly associated with it.[1] He was considered the father of every error, the first heresiarch. It was a joy to tell of his ludicrous misadventures, and his overthrow by the apostle Peter.[2] Even his approach to Christianity was ascribed to the vilest motives. His name so haunted men that they blunderingly read it on pillars[3] where it was not written. His style of symbolism was interpreted in the absurdest fashion: "Helena," which name he identified with "the first intelligence," became a courtesan whom he had bought at the famous slave-market in Tyre.[4] His name became as hateful as that of Judas, and was made the equivalent of *anti-apostle*,[5] the worst of insults, mysteriously designating an impostor by profession,[6] an enemy of the truth. He was the first enemy of Christianity, or the first whom Christianity so regarded. Neither pious fraud nor defamatory scandal was spared to

[1] *Philos.* vi. 1 : 19, 20. These perversities were ascribed only to his followers; but, if the school was open to the charge, some of it must fall upon the master.

[2] See "Antichrist," *passim.*

[3] Justin. (*Apol.* i. 26) mentions an inscription SIMONI · DEO · SANCTO as existing on an island in the Tiber, which also has later Christian mention. This was a Latin inscription to a Sabine deity: SEMONI · DEO · SANCO, a copy of which (now in the Vatican) was found in the island St. Bartholomew in the time of Gregory XIII. (see Baronius, an. 44; Orelli, *inscr.* 1860). There was here a college of *bidentales* in honour of Semo Sancus, containing several like inscriptions (Orelli, 1861; Mommsen, *inscr. Neap.* 6770). Comp. Orelli, 1859, 1862; Henzen, 6999; Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* i. 84. (See Corp. *inscr. Lat.* 542.)

[4] For knowledge of this misconstruction we are indebted to the discovery of the *Philosophumena* (see vi. 1 : 19), which gives fragments of the "Declaration" before referred to.

[5] Clem. *hom.* xvii.

[6] Thus Paul, by the malignant writer of the Clementines.

blacken him.[1] Still, no opposing documents are extant to serve for an exculpatory criticism. All that can be done is to exhibit the complexion of the tradition, and the motive of the calumny. At least, the critic should avoid charging against the memory of the Samaritan theurgist a parallelism which may be purely accidental. The historian Josephus[2] relates that a Jewish magician named Simon, born in Cyprus, played the part of go-between (προξενητής) for the procurator Felix. The circumstances narrated do not fit the case of Simon of Gitton well enough for us to hold him responsible for the acts of one who only happened to have the same name with him and thousands of others, and miraculous pretensions which were unhappily shared by multitudes of his contemporaries.

[1] The account in the "Acts" is not thus hostile: only one mean thing is recorded of him, and of this he may have repented (viii. 24). Perhaps Simon was still living when this account was written.

[2] *Ant.* xx. 7 : 1.

CHAPTER XVI.

GENERAL COURSE OF CHRISTIAN MISSIONS. — A. D. 45.

Barnabas, as we have seen, went up from Antioch to carry to the disciples in Jerusalem the gifts of their Syrian brethren, and was present during some of the commotion stirred among them by the persecution of Herod Agrippa (Acts xii. 1, 25). We will now return with him to Antioch, where all the constructive activity of the body seems just now to be concentrated.

With Barnabas there came a zealous fellow-labourer, his cousin John Mark, closely attached to Peter as his disciple, and son of that Mary whose house was Peter's favourite abode. When Barnabas took with him this new fellow-labourer, he already had in mind, doubtless, the great undertaking in which he was to employ his aid. It may be that even now he began to foresee the divisions of opinion which this work was sure to rouse, and was glad to have with him an assistant, known to be the right-hand man of Peter, — that one of the apostles who held chief authority in general matters.

This undertaking was nothing less than a series of extended missions, which were to set forth from Antioch, having for its ultimate aim the conversion of the whole world. Like every great resolution adopted in the Church, this was ascribed to the direct inspiration of the Holy Spirit. There was firm belief in a special vocation, a supernatural choice, assumed to have been

communicated to the church at Antioch while it fasted and prayed. Some one of the "prophets" of this church, Menahem or Lucius, in one of his fits of "speaking with tongues," may perhaps have uttered words from which it was inferred that Paul and Barnabas were predestined to this mission (Acts xiii. 2). Paul, on his part, was convinced that God had chosen him, from the moment of his birth, for the work to which his whole life was henceforth to be devoted.[1]

These two took with them as assistant, to aid in the material cares of their enterprise, the same John Mark, whom Barnabas had brought with him from Jerusalem (Acts xiii. 5). When all was ready, there were fastings and prayers; hands were laid upon the heads of the two envoys, in token of a mission intrusted to them by the church itself;[2] the grace of God was invoked upon them, and they set forth.[3] In what direction should they go? To what part of the world should they carry their gospel? This is the question now to be considered.

All the first great Christian missions were directed toward the West; in other words, the Roman Empire made their scene and defined their limits. The Parthian realm — excepting some portions of its subject territory lying between the Euphrates and the Tigris — received no Christian missions in the first century,

[1] Gal. i. 15, 16; Acts xxii. 15, 21; xxvi. 17, 18; 1 Cor. i. 1; Rom. i. 1, 5; xv. 15–19.

[2] Paul himself does not speak of such an ordination or consecration: he holds his commission direct from Jesus, and does not regard himself as the envoy of the church of Antioch, any more than that of Jerusalem. The ceremonial may have been introduced by the writer, as a partisan of the hierarchy and of church power (see Introd. p. 14).

[3] Acts xiii. 3; xiv. 25.

— "Babylon," in 1 Peter, v. 13, designating Rome. Toward the East the Tigris made a boundary which Christianity never passed till the time of the Sassanids (the Persian dynasty ruling from the third to the seventh century). The two chief factors determining this all-important decision were the Empire itself and the Mediterranean Sea.

The Mediterranean had been for a thousand years the highway on which all civilisations and all ideas had met and mingled. Delivered by the Romans from piracy, it had become a matchless highway of intercommunication. Travel along its shores had been rendered very easy by a vast system of coastwise transportation. Several things made the map of the Roman Empire the very map of territories reserved for Christian missions, and foreordained to become Christian; namely, the comparative security of the great imperial roads, the security guarantied by public authorities, the diffusion of Jews everywhere along the coast, the general use of the Greek tongue in all the eastern portion, and the one type of civilisation first created by the Greeks and then adopted by the Romans. The Roman "circle of the lands" (*orbis terrarum*) became in due time "the Christian circle;" thus we may say that the founders of the Empire were also the founders of the Christian Empire (*monarchia*), at least that they traced its boundaries. Every province conquered by the Roman Empire was a province conquered for Christianity. Suppose the apostles to have been confronted by an Asia Minor, a Greece, and an Italy, cut up into a hundred petty republics; a Gaul, Spain, Africa, or Egypt, under the control of their old national institutions, we cannot even imagine such a

thing as their success, or even as their undertaking the task at all. The unity of the Empire was the antecedent condition of all that grand system of religious proselytism, setting itself above all nationalities. This the Empire clearly saw in the fourth century, whereupon it became Christian; it saw that Christianity was the religion of which it was itself the unconscious creator, — a religion bounded by its own frontiers, intimately one with it, and capable of giving it a second life. The Church, again, became wholly Roman, and has survived to this day as a relic of the Empire. One might have said to Paul that Claudius was the first of his co-workers; might have said to Claudius that this poor Jew, setting out from Antioch, would found the solidest part of the imperial structure. Both would have been very much astonished, but both would have heard the truth.

Of all countries foreign to Judæa, Syria was naturally the first where Christianity got established. This was inevitable, from its near neighbourhood to Palestine, and from the great number of Jews it already contained.[1] A few years later, Cyprus, Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece, and Italy were visited in turn by apostolic envoys. Southern Gaul, Spain, the sea coast of North Africa, though early evangelised, yet form a later stage in the Christian substructure.

So too with Egypt, which scarcely appears at all in the apostolic history; nay, the Christian missionaries seem systematically to have turned their back upon it. Egypt, which from and after the third century became the theatre of events so important in religious history, was at first very backward regarding Christianity. The

[1] Jos. *War*, ii. 20 : 2; vii. 3 : 3.

only Christian teacher from the school of Alexandria was Apollos; and he had learned Christianity in his travels.[1] The cause of this singular circumstance is to be found in the slight communication that existed between the Egyptian Jews and those of Palestine; above all, in the fact that Judaism in Egypt had in a measure been developed independently. Egypt had Philo and the Therapeutæ: these made a sort of native Christianity,[2] which, so to speak, dispensed it from lending an attentive ear to the other. Pagan Egypt, again, had religious institutions with far greater power of resistance than those of the Greek and Roman Paganism; its religion was still in full vigour; almost at this very time were building the vast temples of Esneh and Ombos; while under the hope of finding one more Ptolemy, a national Messiah, in the boy Cæsarion, the sanctuaries of Denderah and Hermonthis were rising from the earth, which we might compare with the finest works of the Pharaohs. Everywhere Christianity planted itself among the ruins of national ambitions and local worships. In Egypt, too, the bondage of the soul blighted the aspirations which elsewhere opened to Christianity the way of such swift success.

The first appearing of Christianity was, as it were, a flash of light from Syria, which almost at the same moment illumined the three great peninsulas of Asia Minor, Greece, and Italy, and was soon followed by a second gleam, which included almost the entire Mediterranean coast. The track of the ships that bore the apostolic mission is always nearly the same, seeming to follow the wake of a former expedition, which was, in fact, the Jewish emigration. Just as a contagion,

[1] Acts xviii. 24–28.

[2] In Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, etc.

starting from a point in the depth of the Mediterranean, shows itself all at once, through some hidden communication, at a variety of points along the shore, so Christianity had its points of arrival marked out, so to speak, beforehand, — these being mostly designated by Jewish colonies. A church was commonly established where a synagogue had gone before. We might call it a train of powder, or better still an electric chain, along which the new thought flashed almost in an instant.

For a hundred and fifty years, Judaism — till then restricted to the East and Egypt — had taken flight toward the West. Important Jewish colonies were found in Cyrene, Cyprus, Asia Minor, with certain cities of Macedonia, Greece, and Italy.[1] Jews showed the first example of that quality of patriotism since displayed by Parsees, by Armenians, and, to a certain extent, by modern Greeks. This sentiment is very energetic, though not fixed to a special soil; it is the patriotism of merchants, scattered everywhere, who know one another as brothers; a patriotism that forms, not great States, but little autonomous communities in the heart of other States. Strongly bound together, these Jews of the Dispersion made congregations in the cities, almost independent, with their own officers and councils. In some places they had an "ethnarch," or "alabarch," with almost regal powers. They occupied their own quarters, withdrawn from the ordinary jurisdiction, looked on with scorn by the rest of the world, but the abodes of peace and happiness. In general, they were rather poor than rich. The time of great

[1] Cic. *Pro Flacco*, 28; Philo, *In Flacc.* 7; *Leg.* 36; Acts ii. 5–11; vi. 9; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 5361.

Jewish fortunes was not yet come; these began in Spain, under the Visigoths.[1] The control held by Jews over the finances was due to the business incapacity of the barbarians, the scorn felt by the Church for the science of finance, and its superficial notions as to loans at interest. Now, when a Jew is not rich, he is poor; middle-class comfort is not for him. At all events, he can very well endure poverty. What he understands better yet, is to ally the most lofty religious exaltation with the rarest business capacity. Theological eccentricity by no means excludes good sense in practical affairs. In England, America, and Russia, very expert traders are found among the strangest of sectaries, Irvingites, Latter-Day Saints, or Raskolniks.

Jewish life, when piously conducted, has always had the quality of producing much gaiety and warm-heartedness. In this little world people were fond of one another. Their hearts clung to a Past, and the same Past. Their life was encompassed as in a soft embrace, by the ceremonies of religion. This was something like the separate communities that still exist in every great Turkish town; the Greek, Armenian, and Jewish communities in Smyrna, for example, narrow brotherhoods, where everybody knows everybody, where all live together, gossip and intrigue together. In these petty republics, questions of religion always outweigh those of politics, or rather, supply the lack of them. So a heresy is an affair of State; a schism always begins with some question of persons. The Romans rarely, if ever, penetrated these reserved districts. The synagogue puts forth decrees and confers titles of honour,[2] thus

[1] *Lex Visig.* xii. 2, 3 (Walter, *Corp. juris germ. ant.* i. 630).

[2] See "Life of Jesus," p. 177.

acting as a real municipality. Such corporations had great influence. In Alexandria this was at its highest, and dominated the whole inside history of that city.[1] Jews were numerous also at Rome,[2] and constituted a power not to be disdained; Cicero speaks of it as a courageous thing that he once dared to oppose them,[3] while Cæsar favoured them and found them loyal.[4] To keep them in check, Tiberius had recourse to the severest measures.[5] Caligula, whose reign was so disastrous to them in the East, restored their liberty of association at Rome.[6] Claudius, who favoured them in Judæa, was forced to expel them from the city.[7] They were to be met everywhere;[8] and it might be said of them, as of the Greeks, that the conquered gave laws to their conquerors.[9]

The feelings of native populations towards these foreigners were very various. On the one hand, the Jews themselves, wherever they were numerous and well organised, created a strong feeling of repulsion and antipathy by their spirit of jealous seclusion, their rancorous temper, and their unsocial ways.[10] When

[1] Philo, *In Flacc.* 5, 6; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 8: 1; xix. 5: 2; *War*, ii. 18: 7; vii. 10: 1; also a papyrus in *Notices et Extraits*, xviii. 2: 383.

[2] Dion Cass. xxxvii. 17; lx. 6; Philo, *Leg.* 23; Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10: 8; xvii. 11: 1; xviii. 3: 5; Hor. *Sat.* i. 4: 142, 143; 5: 100; 9: 69; Pers. *Sat.* v. 179–184; Suet. *Tib.* 36, *Claud.* 25, *Dom.* 12; Juvenal, iii. 14; vi. 542.

[3] *Pro Flacco*, 28.

[4] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10; Suet. *Jul.* 84.

[5] Suet. *Tib.* 36; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3: 4, 5.

[6] Dion Cass. lx. 6.

[7] Suet. *Claud.* 25; Acts xviii. 2; Dion Cass. lx. 6.

[8] Jos. *War*, vii. 3: 3.

[9] Sen. in Aug. *Civ. Dei*, vi. 11; Rutil. Num. i. 395; Jos. *C. Apion*, ii. 39; Juv. vi. 544; xiv. 96.

[10] Philo, *Flacc.* 5; Tac. *Hist.* v. 4, 5, 8; Dion Cass. xlix. 22; Juv. xiv. 103; Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 1; xl. 3 (fr.); Philostr. *Apoll.* 7; Philo, *Flacc.* and *Leg. ad Caium.*

they were free, they were really a privileged class, for they had the benefits of political society without its burdens.[1] Charlatans among them profited by the curiosity felt towards their worship, pretending to expose their secrets, and committing all manner of knavery.[2] Violent and scurrilous pamphlets, like that of Apion, from which pagan writers too often got their information,[3] went about, serving as food to pagan spite. The Jews in general seem to have been apt at making the most of petty grievances. They were looked at as a secret society, ill-disposed to the rest of mankind, pushing their way at all cost, and at any damage to other men.[4] Their queer customs, their aversion to certain foods, their dirt, their low-bred air, their evil smell,[5] their religious scruples, their quiddling observance of the Sabbath, — all was found ridiculous.[6] Shut out from society, the Jews naturally had no care to pass as gentlemen. As travellers they were everywhere to be met, in clothes shiny with dirt, a gawky air, a tired look, pale face, and big bleary eyes,[7] open mouths, walking apart with their wives and children, their packages of rugs, and the hamper that contained all their outfit.[8] In

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10; xvi. 6; xx. 8 : 7; Philo, *Flacc.* and *Leg.*

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3 : 4, 5; Juv. vi. 543.

[3] See Jos. *C. Apion*; references as above to Tacitus and Diod. Siculus; Trog. Pomp. (Justin), xxxvi. 2; Ptol. Hæphest. or Chennus (Westermann, *Script. poet. gr.* 194; Quintil. iii. 7 : 2.

[4] Cic. *Flacc.* 28; Tac. *Hist.* v. 5; Juv. xiv. 103; Diod. Sic. and Philostr. (as above); Rutil. Num. i. 383.

[5] Mart. iv. 4; Amm. Marcell. xxii. 5.

[6] Suet. *Aug.* 76; Hor. *Sat.* i. 9 : 69; Juv. iii. 13–16, 296; vi. 156–160, 542–547; xiv. 96–107; Mart. *Epigr.* iv. 4; vii. 29, 34, 54; xi. 95; xii. 57; Rutil. Num. (as above); Jos. *C. Ap.* ii. 13; Philo, *Leg.* 26–28.

[7] Mart. *Epigr.* xii. 57.

[8] Juv. *Sat.* iii. 14; vi. 542.

towns they practised the meanest crafts, as beggars,[1] ragmen, peddlers, and matchboys.[2] Their past history and law was unfairly flung in their face: sometimes they were denounced as superstitious and cruel;[3] sometimes as atheists and despisers of the gods,[4] their hatred of images seeming mere impiety. Circumcision, especially, served as the butt of never-ending jests.[5]

But everybody did not judge in this shallow way. The Jews had as many friends as slanderers. Their sobriety, good morals, and simplicity of worship charmed whole multitudes. Men felt a certain superiority in them. A great monotheistic and Mosaic propaganda was forming;[6] a powerful cyclone (so to speak) was gathering about this little clan of peculiar people. The poor Jewish peddler across the Tiber,[7] with his wicker tray of haberdashery, might often come home at night rich with doles from some pious hand.[8] Women, especially, were drawn to these threadbare missionaries.[9] Juvenal includes the inclination to the Jewish worship among the vices which he charges against the ladies of his time;[10] while those of them who were converted boasted of the treasure they had found, and the glad-

[1] Juv. iii. 296; vi. 543; Mart. i. 42; xii. 57.

[2] Mart. i. 42; xii. 57; Stat. *Silv.* vi. 73, 74; Forcellini, *s. v. sulfuratum.*

[3] Hor. *Sat.* i. 5: 100; Juv. vi. 544; xiv. 96; Apul. *Flor.* i. 6; Dion Cass. lxviii. 32.

[4] Tac. *Hist.* v. 5, 9; Dion. Cass. lxvii. 14.

[5] Hor. *Sat.* i. 9: 70; *Apella* (in Forcellini the word seems to be *Apion*); Avitus, *poem.* v. 364; Juv. xiv. 99; Mart. vii. 29, 34, 54; xi. 95.

[6] Jos. *C. Ap.* ii. 39; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; *Hist.* v. 5; Hor. *Sat.* i. 4: 142, 143; Juv. xiv. 95, 96; Dion Cass. xxxvii. 17; lxvii. 14.

[7] Mart. i. 42; xii. 57.

[8] Juv. vi. 546.

[9] Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3: 5; xx. 2: 4; *War*, ii. 20: 2; Acts xiii. 50; xvi. 14.

[10] See the passages cited above.

ness of heart they had won.[1] The old Greek and Roman spirit made strong resistance: contempt and hatred for Jews were a mark of all cultivated minds, — Cicero, Horace, Seneca, Juvenal, Tacitus, Quintilian, Suetonius.[2] On the other hand, that prodigious mass of mixed populations subjected under the Empire, to which the old Roman spirit and Grecian wisdom were alike strange or indifferent, thronged in crowds toward a Society in which they found touching examples of harmony, charity, and mutual help,[3] content with one's condition, a liking for toil,[4] and a high-hearted poverty. Beggary, which was afterwards a condition wholly Christian, was then a Jewish one. The beggar by trade, "shaped to it by his mother," was in the mind of a poet of that time figured as a Jew.[5]

Exemption from certain civil burdens, in particular from military service, might also aid in making the Jewish lot seem enviable.[6] The State then exacted many sacrifices and offered few delights. Its moral climate was icy cold, like that of a high, flat, shelterless table-land. Life so bleak in the heart of paganism resumed its charm and value in the mild atmosphere of the Synagogue and the Church. It was not liberty you found there. The brethren kept a watch upon one another, and crossed one another's paths incessantly. But whatever stir might perplex the inner life of these little communities, there was infinite gladness to be found there; one never left it, there was no such thing

[1] Jos. *Ant.* xx. 2: 5; 4: 1.

[2] As shown in passages above cited. Strabo shows far more good sense and penetration (xvi. 2: 34); comp. Dion Cass. xxxvii. 17, 18.

[3] Tac. *Hist.* v. 5.

[4] Jos. *C. Ap.* ii. 39.

[5] Mart. xii. 57.

[6] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10: 6; 11–14

as an apostate. There the poor man was content with little, saw wealth without envy, and was rich in the composure of a good conscience.[1] The truly democratic thought, that worldliness is madness, that wealth is vain, and grandeur is unholy, had a fine expression here. There was little knowledge of the pagan world, which was judged with extravagant severity. Roman civilisation seemed a mass of corruption and odious vice (Rom. i. 24–32), just as an honest labourer of our day, steeped in socialistic declamations, paints to himself "the aristocrats" in the blackest colours. But here was life, gaiety, interest, such as we find to-day in the poorest synagogues of the Polish and Galician Jews. The lack of elegance and delicacy in living was made good by a priceless family spirit and patriarchal kindliness. In high society, on the other hand, selfishness and solitude of soul had borne their ripest fruit.

The word of the prophet Zechariah (viii. 23) was now coming true: that "men from all languages of the nations shall take the hem of the garment of one that is a Jew, saying, Take us to Jerusalem; we will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you." There was no city where the Sabbath, the fast, and other Jewish observances were not kept.[2] Josephus[3] challenges those who doubt this to consider their own country or even their own house, to see if they will not find confirmation of what he says. This repute was greatly aided by the presence in Rome and near the emperor of many of Herod's household, who conspic-

[1] Ecclus. x. 25–27.
[2] Hor. *Sat.* i. 9: 69; Pers. v. 179; Juv. vi. 159; xiv. 96.
[3] *C. Ap.* ii. 39.

uously practised their rite before the face of all.[1] The Sabbath observance, too, became inevitable in the quarters occupied by Jews. Their obstinate refusal to open their shops on this day compelled their neighbours to change their customs accordingly. So at Salonica we may say that the Jewish Sabbath is still kept in our day; for there the Jews are numerous enough and rich enough to make the law, and prescribe the day of rest by the mere closing of their counting-houses.

In the conquest of the West by the East, the Syrian was almost as efficient as the Jew, and was often his associate.[2] Each was sometimes mistaken for the other; and Cicero thought he had hit on the trait common to both, in calling them "races born for slavery."[3] This was, in truth the thing that assured their future; for just then the future was for slaves. A quality in the Syrian no less essential was his docility, his suppleness, the thin lucidity of his mind. The Syrian nature is like a fleeting image in the clouds. For a moment, we may see certain lines delicately traced; but these never make up a complete design. In the shadow, or by the uncertain light of a lamp, a Syrian woman, under her veil, with her vague glance and boundless pliancy, will cause a few moments of illusion. But when you would analyse this beauty, it will not abide your gaze. And then, this evanescent beauty lasts hardly for three or four years. In the Syrian race the charm is in the child of five or six, — just the opposite from the Greek, where the child is of small account, the youth inferior to

[1] Pers. v. 179–184; Juv. vi. 157–160. Hence the striking attention paid to Judaism which we notice in the Roman writers of this century, especially the satirists.

[2] Juv. iii. 62.

[3] Cic. *De prov. consul.* 5: *Judæis et Syris, nationibus natis servituti.*

the grown man, and the grown man inferior to the aged. The children who most delighted me in my first visit to Syria, I found, four years later, ugly, commonplace, and heavy. Intelligence in a Syrian wins you by a certain swiftness and lightness of touch, but lacks firm quality; like the "golden wine" of the Lebanon, which tickles the palate delightfully, but soon palls. The true "gift divine" is that which is at once strong and delicate, exhilarating and permanent. Greece is better appreciated to-day than ever before, and so it will always be, more and more.

Many emigrants from Syria, drawn to the West by the hope of a fortune, were more or less attached to Judaism. Those who were not kept true to their own village worship;[1] that is, to the memory of some temple dedicated to a local Jupiter — meaning, commonly, the Supreme God under some special name;[2] for under the guise of their foreign gods the Syrians held to a sort of monotheism. Their gods are mostly so many names for the Sun, brothers (as it were) of the One God, — at least when put beside the sharply marked divine personalities of Greek and Roman polytheism.[3] Like long enervating strains of melody, these Syrian cults might seem less bare and hard than the Latin, less empty than the Greek. The Syrian women caught from them something voluptuous and intense. They were at all times strange creatures, tossed to and fro between the devil and the Deity, floating between the possessed and

[1] Πατρῴοις θεοῖς, a common formula in Syrian inscriptions: *Corp.*, etc., 4449, 4450, 4451, 4463, 4479, 4480, 6015.

[2] *Corp.*, etc., 2271, 4474, 4475, 5853, 5936: *Miss. de Phén.* ii. 2: inscr. of Abedat.

[3] See my notes in *Journ. Asiat.* Feb., Mar., 1859, p. 259, and in the *Mission de Phénicie*, ii. 2.

the saintly. The saint of solid virtues, of heroic renunciations, belongs to other races and other climes; the Syrian saint is the saint of warm imagination, of absolute entrancement. The "bewitched" woman (*possédée*) of the Middle Age is the slave of Satan through a base nature or a deed of sin; her counterpart in Syria is insane through some illusion, one whose heart is lacerated, who retaliates by frenzy or shuts herself up in dumbness,[1] and will not be healed until a soft word has been spoken, or a tender glance bestowed. When taken to the Western world, these Syrian women would gain influence, sometimes by evil feminine arts, but oftener by a certain moral elevation and a practical faculty of their own. This was especially the case a century and a half later, when men of the highest rank in Rome married Syrian women, who at once took great control in affairs. The Moslem woman of to-day, a howling fury, stupidly fanatic, who hardly lives for anything but mischief, almost incapable of virtue, — such a creature should not drive from our memory women like Julia Domna (wife of Sept. Severus), Julia Mæsa, Julia Mamæa (mother of Alex. Severus), Julia Soëmie, who in matters of religion brought to Rome a tolerance and a class of mystical emotions till then unknown. It is to be noted that the Syrian sway thus brought to Rome was favourable to Christianity; that Mamæa, and afterwards the emperor Philip the Arab, born in the Hauran, were reputed to be Christian. The Christianity of the third and fourth centuries had its peculiar home in Syria; and, after Palestine, Syria had the greatest share in its extension.

[1] See in Land's Syrian Code (*Anecd. Syr.*, i. 152) for cases such as I have witnessed.

In the first century, the pervasive activity of the Syrian was chiefly felt at Rome. Holding most of the petty callings, as body-servant, business agent, litter-carrier, the Syrian[1] found his way everywhere, taking with him the language and manners of his country.[2] He had neither the high temper nor the philosophic disdain of the European, still less his vigour; he was weak in body, pale, often feverish, unable to eat or sleep at regular hours like our heavy and sturdy race; he slept little and lightly, died young, and was an habitual invalid, like the Christian Syrian of our day. His good qualities a lowly temper, gentleness, readiness of speech, kindliness of heart; no sturdiness of mind, but much charm; showing little shrewdness except in matters of trade, but an astonishing warmth, and a winning way quite like a woman's. Having never had political life in view, he was quite specially adapted to religious activities. The poor Maronite you see in the Lebanon to-day, womanish, humble-minded, tattered, has made one of the greatest of revolutions. His ancestor, the Syrian at Rome, was the most zealous bearer of "the good news" to all the afflicted. Every year brought to Greece, Italy, or Gaul colonies of those Syrians, driven by their native bent for petty occupations.[3] They were well known on shipboard by their numerous household; the troops of pretty children, almost all of an age, who followed them; the mother, with her childish air like a girl of fourteen, clinging close to her husband, submissive, softly smiling, hardly taller than her

[1] See Forcellini, *s. v. Syrus*, a general name for "Orientals": Leblant, *Inscr. chrét. de la Gaule*, i. 207, 328.

[2] Juv. iii. 62, 63.

[3] See inscriptions in *Mém. de la Soc. des Antiquaires de France*, 38: 4; Leblant, i. 144, 207, 324, 353, 375; ii. 259, 459.

older boys.[1] In this quiet group heads are not strongly marked: surely here is no Archimedes, Phidias, or Plato! But this Syrian trader, when he gets to Rome, will be a kind and tender-hearted man, charitable to his own people, and loving to the poor. He will chat with the slaves, and show them a refuge where these wretches, driven by Roman cruelty to the loneliest desolation, will find some little comfort. Those master-races, Greek and Latin, made for greatness, knew not what to make of a station so lowly.[2] In these races the slave spent his life in revolt and malice, — greedy, lying, spiteful, his master's natural enemy:[3] such was the ideal slave of antiquity, — thus, in a manner, proving his nobility, for so he protests against a condition contrary to nature. The good Syrian makes no such protest, but accepts his low estate, and seeks to make the best of it. He wins his master's good-will, ventures to speak to him, knows how to please his mistress. Thus goes this great agent of democracy, untying mesh by mesh the network of ancient civilisation. The old societies, founded on contempt for man, inequality of race, and military valour, were doomed. Weakness, lowliness, are henceforth to be an advantage, a finishing touch of virtue (2 Cor. xii. 9). For yet three centuries, Roman nobleness and Greek wisdom will maintain the struggle. That these wretches should be got rid of by the thousand, Tacitus finds a good thing: "Cheap loss if they all perish!" quoth he.[4] The Roman

[1] The Maronites still have their colonies — like the Jews, Armenians, and Greeks, but on a smaller scale — almost everywhere in the Levant.

[2] See *Cic. De off.* i. 42; *Dion Halicarn.* ii. 28; ix. 25.

[3] See their types in Plautus and Terence.

[4] *Ann.* ii. 85.

aristocracy will chafe, and find it ill that such a mob should have its gods and institutions. But the victory is foredoomed. The Syrian — the poor man who loves his fellows, shares with them, acts with them — will win the day. The Roman aristocracy will perish, because it knows no pity.

To understand the impending revolution, we need to take account of the political, social, moral, mental, and religious condition of those lands where Jewish proselytism had opened the furrows wherein Christian instruction should cast the seed. This study will, as I trust, clearly show that the world's conversion to Jewish and Christian ideas was inevitable; and will leave us only to wonder that the conversion was so slow and late.

CHAPTER XVII.

GENERAL CONDITION OF THE WORLD. — A. D. 45.

The political condition of the world was very gloomy. All authority was centred in Rome and in her legions; and here were found the most shameful and degrading scenes. The Roman aristocracy, which had conquered the world, and which alone remained in executive control under the Cæsars, was given up to the most unbridled debauch of crime that the world has ever known. Julius and Augustus, in founding the imperial monarchy, had seen the need of their time with perfect accuracy. The world, politically speaking, was so low that no other form of government was possible. Since Rome had acquired numerous provinces, the old rule of patrician houses — a sort of obstinate and evil-hearted Tories — could endure no longer.[1] But Augustus had wholly failed of his true political duty, in leaving the future to chance. Cæsarism, without a law of inheritance, without fixed rules of adoption, without a law of election, without constitutional limits, was like an enormous weight on a ship's deck without ballast; there was no avoiding the most dreadful shocks. Thrice within a century — under Caligula, Nero, and Domitian — the mightiest power that ever existed fell into the hands of men horribly criminal or else insane. Hence horrors that have hardly been outdone by the worst

[1] Tac. *Ann.* i. 2; Florus, iv. 3; Pomponius, in the *Digest*, i. 1: 2; fr. 2.

monsters of Mogul dynasties. In this fatal succession of emperors, we are fain almost to pardon a Tiberius, who was not wholly evil till his latest years; or a Claudius, who at worst was queer, ill-balanced, and ill surrounded. Rome became a training-school of vice and cruelty. Still, we must add that the evil came chiefly from the East, from those low-lived flatterers, wretches whom Syria and Egypt sent to Rome,[1] where, making their gain of the oppression the real Romans suffered under, they felt themselves to be all-powerful among the greater criminals who governed. The most shocking infamies of the Empire, such as the deifying of the emperor in his lifetime, came from the East, chiefly from Egypt, which was then one of the rottenest communities in all the world.[2]

The true Roman spirit, however, still survived; human nobleness was not wholly blotted out. A lofty tradition of public virtue remained in some families, which came to power with Nerva, and made the glory of the age of the Antonines. Tacitus was their eloquent interpreter. A time when natures were ripening so radically honourable as Quintilian, Pliny the Younger, and Tacitus is not a time for utter despair. The surface overflow did not reach the deep body of uprightness and sobriety in the better society of Rome; a few families still offered models of good order, devotion to duty, harmony, and solid virtue. In the noble house were to be found admirable wives and sisters.[3] Was there ever a sadder

[1] Helicon, Apelles, Eucerus, etc., Eastern "kings," were considered by the Romans as masters in tyranny to the bad emperors: Dion Cass. lix. 24.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* iv. 55, 56; see inscription of the parasite of Antony in *Comptes rendus*, etc., 1864, p. 166.

[3] See the funeral discourse of Q. Lucretius Vespillo on his wife Turia,

destiny than that of the young and pure Octavia, daughter of Claudius, Nero's wife, unstained amid all infamies, murdered at twenty-two, without ever having tasted an hour of joy? Inscriptions are not rare, describing wives as *castissimæ*, *univiræ*.[1] Wives accompanied their husbands into exile;[2] and others (as Arria) shared their heroic death. The old Roman simplicity had not perished; education of children was still serious and careful. The noblest women wrought in wool with their own hands; and in the best families cares of the toilet were little known.[3]

Those excellent men of State, who, so to speak, sprang from the ground under Trajan, were no sudden growth. They had been in service in former reigns, though with little influence, cast into the shade as they were by the freedmen and worthless favourites of the emperor. Men of the noblest valour thus held high positions under Nero. The officers as a class were good; the accession of bad emperors, disastrous as it was, could not change the general course of things, or the substance of the State. The Empire was not tottering, but in all the strength of vigorous youth. Decay came two centuries later; and, strange to say, under a

in the text first published in full by Mommsen (*Mém. de l'Acad. de Berlin*, 1863, p. 455); also that on Murdia (Orelli, No. 4860), and on Matidia by the emperor Hadrian (in Mommsen's *Mém.* p. 483). The Roman satirists have put the foibles or vices of women in too strong relief, — as if one should take those of the seventeenth century for a true picture of society at that time.

[1] Orelli, 2647, 2648, 2677, 2742, 4530, 4860; Henzen, 7382, 7383, 7406; Renier (Algeria), 1987. The epithets, even if false, show at least "the homage paid to virtue."

[2] Pliny, *Epist.* vii. 9; ix. 13; Appian, *Bell. Civ.* iv. 16. Helvidius Priscus was thus twice accompanied by his wife Fannia, who was a third time exiled after his death.

[3] Suet. *Aug.* 73; funeral discourse on Turia (l. 30).

far less evil line of sovereigns. To look only at the political side, the situation was like that of France since the Revolution; which, with no regular succession of powers, can yet pass through many a crisis of such peril, without deadly hurt to its interior organisation or national strength. Or, looking at the moral aspect, we may compare the period of which I speak to the eighteenth century, which we might think utterly corrupt, to judge from memoirs, manuscript papers, and collections of anecdotes; in which, notwithstanding, some great house preserved such lofty austerity of morals.[1]

Philosophy had found allies in the high-born Roman families, and made a noble stand. The Stoic school nourished the strong characters of Cremutius Cordus, Thraseas, Arria, Helvidius Priscus, Annæus Cornutus, and Musonius Rufus, admirable types of aristocratic virtue. The harshness and exaggerated severities of this school were a reaction from the horrible cruelty of Cæsarian rule. The constant study of good men was to harden themselves against torture, and prepare for death.[2] Lucan, in bad taste, Persius with higher talent, expressed the loftiest emotions of a great soul. The philosopher Seneca, Pliny the elder, and Papirius Fabianus held to a lofty tradition of science and philosophy. Not everything gave way. There were still wise men, but too often there was nothing else left to them but to die. At times the meaner classes of

[1] So we are to explain the far too severe charges of Paul in Rom. i. 24–30. Paul knew nothing of the better Roman society. His invectives, too, are like the pulpit declamations of every time, which we must not take too literally.

[2] Sen. *Epist.* 12, 24, 26, 58, 70; *De ira*, iii. 15; *De tranq. animi*, 10.

mankind would hold the upper hand; then a spirit of giddiness and cruelty would prevail, and make Rome into a real hell.[1]

This government, so frightfully capricious at Rome, was far better in the provinces, where the shocks that smote the capital were little felt. Spite of its faults, Roman administration was better than the kingdoms and republics which it had crushed. The age of the one-city sovereignty was gone by for centuries. Those petty States were self-destroyed through their self-seeking, their jealous temper, their ignorance or disregard of private liberties. The old Greek life, all conflict, all on the outside, no longer met anybody's need. It had been charming in its day; but that brilliant Olympus, that democracy of demigods, had lost its freshness and become dry, cold, weak, empty, and thin, for lack of real goodness and sound integrity. This lack was the justification, first, of the Macedonian dominion, and afterwards of Roman rule. As yet the Empire knew not the ills of excessive centralisation; until the time of Diocletian it left much liberty to provinces and cities; kingdoms almost independent remained, under Roman protection, in Palestine, in Syria, in Asia Minor, in Lesser Armenia, and in Thrace. After the time of Caligula these kingdoms began to be a public peril, only from the neglect to observe toward them the rules of broad and profound statesmanship which Augustus had laid down.[2] The free cities, still very numerous, were governed by their own laws; they had the law-making power and all the administrative functions of an independent State; down to the third century the municipal decrees were put forth under the

[1] See Rev. Ch. xvii.; Sen. *Epist.* 95: 16–20. [2] Suet. *Aug.* 48.

formula, "The Senate and People," etc., as we see in numberless inscriptions. Theatres served not merely for the pleasures of the stage, but were everywhere centres of opinion and action. Under various designations, most cities were little commonwealths. The municipal spirit was very strong in them, as we see in Plutarch;[1] only the right of making war was taken from them, that baleful right, which had converted the world into a field of blood. "The benefits conferred by the Roman people upon the human race" made the theme of declamations sometimes adulatory, but not wholly insincere.[2] At the bottom of all men's thought was veneration for "the world-wide majesty of the Roman peace,"[3] and the idea of a grand democracy under the tutelage of Rome.[4] A Greek rhetorician maintained with vast learning that the glory of Rome was to be gathered, as a sort of common patrimony, from all branches of the Hellenic race.[5] As to Syria, Asia Minor, and Egypt, we may say that no liberty was crushed in any of them by the Roman conquest. These countries were long since dead to political life, or else had never had it.

In short, despite the extortion of governors and the acts of violence inevitable under an absolute government, the world, in many respects, had never been so fortunate. There was such advantage in a rule proceeding from a distant centre of authority that it was not rendered hateful even by the robberies of procon-

[1] *Præcept. ger. reipubl.* xv. 3, 4; *An seni sit gerenda respublica.*

[2] Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10: 22, 23; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 55, 56; Rutil. Num. *Itin.* i. 63.

[3] *Immensa romanæ pacis majestas* (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* 27 : 1).

[4] Æl. Arist. *Elogium Romæ;* Plut. *Fortuna Romanorum;* Philo, *Leg.* 21, 22, 39, 40.

[5] Dion Halic. *Antiq. Rom.* i. (init.).

suls in the latter years of the Republic. And besides, the Julian Law had greatly limited the field of abuses and extortions. The emperor's inanities and cruelties, excepting under Nero, struck only at the Roman aristocracy and the immediate court-circle. A man who chose to live outside of politics had never been better off. An ancient republic, where every man (as under Solon's law) was forced to take sides in party quarrels, made a very inconvenient home, where one was always liable to be thrown off his track or banished. But now the time seemed expressly suited to proselyting on a large scale, on a range above petty municipal strifes or dynastic rivalries. Attacks upon liberty came much oftener from what was left of provincial or municipal independence than from the Roman rule.[1] I have already had, and shall have again, many an occasion in my present task to point this out.

In those of the conquered countries where political cravings had for centuries ceased to exist, and where the only right lost was that of tearing one another to pieces by incessant wars, the Empire made an era of general prosperity and well-being — we may, without paradox, add personal liberty — such as had never been known.[2] Freedom of trade and industry, which the old Greek republics had never dreamed of, was now made possible; while, in another direction, freedom of thinking had gained every way under the new system of rule. This kind of freedom is far more favoured by having to do with a king or prince than with jealous and narrow-minded citizen-rulers. In the ancient republics such a thing did not exist. The Greeks effected

[1] See Athenæus, xii. 68; Ælian, *Var. Hist.* ix. 12; Suidas, *s. v.* ἐπίκουρος.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* i. 2.

great things without it, owing to their unrivalled genius; but, as we should not forget, Athens had her inquisition out-and-out — as we see by the character of Plato's Euthyphron. The grand inquisitor was the "king-archon;" the Holy Office was the regal Porch, whence accusations of "impiety" proceeded. These were very numerous, and they made the class of cases which we find oftenest in the Attic orators. Not only philosophic heresies, such as the denial of God or Providence, but the slightest infringement on the municipal rites, the advocacy of foreign religions, the most childish breach of the scrupulous legislation as to mysteries, were crimes visited with death. The gods whom Aristophanes derided upon the stage would sometimes kill. They killed Socrates, and they all but killed Alcibiades. Anaxagoras, Protagoras, Theodore "the atheist," Diagoras of Malos, Prodicus of Ceos, Stilpo, Aristotle, Theophrastus, Aspasia, and Euripides were all more or less seriously molested.[1] In short, freedom of thought was a growth of the kingdoms that resulted from the Macedonian conquest. The Attali, the Ptolemies, were the first who gave to thinkers the opportunities which none of the old republics had ever offered them. The Roman Empire continued to do the same. There was, under the Empire, more than one arbitrary act against the philosophers; but this was always when they interfered in politics, — as Helvidius Priscus under Vespasian. We should seek in vain for a text against liberty of thinking in the whole body of Roman Law before Constantine, or for a law-trial on an abstract opinion in all

[1] Diog. *Laert.* 2 : 101, 116; 5 : 5, 6, 37, 38; 9 : 52; Athen. 13 : 92; 15 : 52; *Æl.* 2 : 23; 3 : 36; Plut. *Pericles*, 32; *De plac.* i. 7 : 2; Diod. Sic. xiii. 6 : 7; Schol. in Arist. *Birds*, 1073.

the history of the emperors. Not a man of learning was disturbed. Men who in the Middle Age would have been burned — such as Galen, Lucian, and Plotinus — lived in peace under the shelter of the law. The Empire established a period of liberty, by putting an end to the despotic authority of the family, city, and tribe, and supplanting these despotisms by the State. Doubtless the Empire persecuted Christianity bitterly at various times;[1] but did not bring it to a halt. The old republics would have made its career impossible; and Judaism might have stifled it but for the pressure of the Roman power. It was the Roman magistrates that prevented the Pharisees from killing it.[2]

Broad ideas of universal brotherhood, coming mostly from the Stoics,[3] were an outgrowth from the broader system and the less exclusive training now established.[4] There were thoughts of a new era and of new worlds.[5] There was vast public wealth; and, despite the great general ignorance of economics, comfort was widely diffused. Morals were not so bad as is often supposed. Vice, it is true, was displayed at Rome with revolting nakedness;[6] and the public spectacles had brought in a shocking degradation. Some countries, like Egypt,

[1] I shall try to show hereafter that these persecutions, at least before that of Decius, have been exaggerated.

[2] The early Christians showed much respect for Roman authority. Rom. xiii. 1–4; 1 Pet. iv. 14–16; for Luke's view, see Introd. pp. 13, 14.

[3] Diog. *Laert.* 7 : 1, 32, 33; Euseb. *Præp. ev.* xv. 15; Cic. *De leg.* and *De off.*

[4] Ter. *Heaut.* i. 1 : 77; Cic. *De Fin.* v. 23; Ov. *Fast.* ii. 684; Luc. vi. 54; Sen. *Ep.* 48; 95, 51; *De ira*, 1 : 5; 3 : 43; Arr. *Epict.* i. 9 : 6; ii. 5 : 26; Plut. *De fort Rom.* 2; *Alex.* 1 : 8, 9.

[5] Virg. *Ecl.* iv.; Sen. *Med.* 375.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; Suet. *Tib.* 35; Ovid, *Fasti*, ii. 497–514.

had sunk to the very depths of depravity. But in most of the provinces there was a middle class, where kind temper, conjugal fidelity, home virtues, and uprightness were widely prevalent.[1] Is there anywhere a more charming picture than we find in Plutarch, of family life in a worthy middle class in a small city? What kindness of heart, what gentleness of manners, what pure and lovely simplicity![2] Cheronæa was evidently not the only place where life was thus clean and innocent.

Customs, outside of Rome as well, were still in some ways cruel, either as a relic of old manners, everywhere so bloody, or by the special influence of the Roman brutality. Still, here, too, there was progress. What pure and gentle emotion, what shade of tender sadness, had not found its finest expression in the verse of Virgil and Tibullus? The world was growing softer, losing its antique rigour, coming to be more smooth and sympathetic. Humane maxims were current: "Tenderness for human kind," says Cicero; "Man is a sacred thing to man," adds Seneca.[3] Woman, thanks to the Roman right of dower, was more and more her own mistress; a humaner treatment of slaves was enjoined, and Seneca had them at his own table.[4] The

[1] Inscriptions relating to women are often tender: "A mother to all, a parent helpful to all," Renier, *Alg.* 1987, 2756; Mommsen, *Inscr.* 1431; "two examples of virtue and purity": *Not.*, etc., *de la Soc. de Constantine*, 1865, p. 158; see Guérin, *Voy. dans Tunis*, i. 289; and Orelli, 4648. Many of these are of later date, but the sentiments were not novel.

[2] Demosth. 2; *Dial. on love*, 2; *Consolation* (to his wife).

[3] Cic. *De fin.* v. 23; Sen. *Ep.* 95:33.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 42, 43; Suet. *Claud.* 25; Dion Cass. 60:29; Pliny, *Ep.* viii. 16; Inscr. at Lanuvium (Mommsen, *de coll.* etc.); Sen. rhet. *Controv.* 3:21; 7:6; Sen. (phil.) *Ep.* 47:13; *De benef.* 3:18, 19; Colum. *De re rust.* 1:8; Plut. *Cato*, 5; *De ira*, 11.

slave is no longer (as a matter of course) the spiteful and grotesque figure brought on the comic stage to provoke peals of laughter, whom Cato advises us to treat as a beast of burden.[1] The times are greatly changed; the slave is morally his master's equal, admitted to be capable of virtue, fidelity, and devotion, as proved by instances.[2] Prejudices of high birth were fading out.[3] Many humane and just laws were passed, even under the worst emperors.[4] Tiberius was an able financier, and founder of an excellent system of public credit.[5] Nero introduced into the customs-office improvements which shame even our own time.[6] Legislation was much advanced, though the death penalty was still absurdly lavish. Love of the poor, sympathy for all, and almsgiving were acknowledged virtues.[7]

The theatre was one of the most unendurable scandals to good people, and one of the chief grounds of the hate felt by Jews and all their sympathisers against the pagan civilisation. These gigantic pits seemed to them

[1] Cato, *De re rust.* 58, 59, 104; Plut. *Cato*, 4, 5; comp. Ecclus. 33: 25, 26.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 60; Dion Cass. xlvii. 10; lx. 16; lxii. 13; lxvi. 14; Suet. *Caius*, 16; App. *Bell. civ.* iv. 17, 36–51; Juv. vi. 476, etc. (of the basest class).

[3] Hor. *Sat.* i. 6; Cic. *Epist.* iii. 7; Sen. rhet. *Controv.* i. 6.

[4] Suet. *Caius*, 15, 16; *Claud.* 19, 23, 25; Nero, 16; Dion Cass. lx. 25, 29.

[5] Tac. *Ann.* vi. 17; comp. iv. 6.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 50, 51; Suet. *Nero*, 10.

[7] *Inscr. lat.* no. 1027 (of the age of Augustus, on Evodus, a jeweller, "a good man and merciful, loving the poor"); Egger, *Mém. d'hist.* 351, 352; Perrot, *Explor. of Galatia*, 118, 119; Fun. disc. on Matidia, by Adrian (*Mém. de l'Acad. de Berlin*, 1863, p. 489); Mommsen, *Inscr. Neap.* 1431, 2868, 4880; Sen. rhet. *Contr.* i. 1; iii. 19; iv. 27; viii. 6; Sen. phil. *De clem.* ii. 5, 6; *De benef.* i. 1; ii. 11; iv. 14; vii. 31; Leblant, *Inscr. gall.* ii. 23; Orelli, 4657; Fea, *Fasti consol.* 90; Garrucci, *Cimit. hebr.* 44.

the cesspool for the simmering of every vice. While the lower benches applauded, those above displayed only repulsion and horror. Gladiatorial contests with difficulty got footing in the provinces; the Greeks, at least, abhorred them, and generally kept to their ancient games.[1] Bloody contests always bore in the East strong testimony of their Roman origin.[2] The Athenians, having once, out of rivalry with Corinth,[3] proposed to imitate these barbarous sports, a philosopher (it is said) rose and moved that they should first cast down the altar of Mercy.[4] Horror of the theatre, the race-course, and the gymnasium — those public places which made an essential feature in a Greek or Roman town — thus became one of the deepest and most powerful of Christian sentiments. Ancient civilisation was out-of-doors; everything went on in the open air, before the public eye; with us, on the contrary, life is private and in-doors. The theatre inherited from the Agora and the Forum; a curse upon the theatre included the whole structure of society; and the deepest jealousy arose between the Church on one side and Public Games upon the other. The slave, driven from the games, took refuge in the Church. I have never sat in those dreary arenas, which are always the best preserved monuments of an ancient city, without seeing in my mind's eye the struggle of the two worlds: here the honest poor man, already half-Christian, seated on the lowest bench, which he quits with muffled head and angry heart; there a philosopher rising on a sudden

[1] *Corp. inscr. gr.* 2758.

[2] *Ibid.* 2194 *b*, 2511, 2759 *b*.

[3] Corinth was in the Roman period a foreign colony, planted by Julius and Augustus on the ruins of the ancient city.

[4] Lucian, *Demonax*, 57.

and venting his indignation upon the degraded crowd.[1] Such instances were rare in the first century; still the protest began to be heard,[2] and the theatre gradually became a place of very ill repute.[3]

Legislation and administration in the Empire were all at odds and ends. Despotism in the centre, special grants (franchises) to cities and provinces, caprices of governors, and violent disorders in the free communities, met and clashed in the most extraordinary way; but religious liberty was the gainer. The excellent systematic administration under Trajan and his successors was far more damaging to the new religion than that irregular hap-hazard condition, without a strict police, in the times of the Cæsars.

Institutions of public relief, founded on the maxim that the State has parental duties toward its members, were not broadly developed till after Nerva and Trajan.[4] Some trace of them, however, may be found in the first century.[5] Already there were help for children,[6] giving of food to the poor, bakers' taxes, relief to tradesmen, care for supplies, policies of insurance for riggers, etc., bread-tickets securing grain at a reduced price.[7] All the emperors, without exception, were very solici-

[1] Dion Cass. lxvi. 15.

[2] Æl. Aristides, *On the Comedy*, i. 751 (ed. Dindorf).

[3] Their ruins in Asia Minor are still places of infamous resort (see Ovid, *Ars am.* i. 89, 90.

[4] Orelli-Henzen, 1172, 3362, 3363, 6669; Guérin, *Tunis*, ii. 59; Borghesi, *Works*, iv. 269, 270; E. Desjardins, *De tab. alim.* (Paris, 1854); Aur. Victor, *Epit.* Nerva; Pliny, *Ep.* i. 8; vii. 18.

[5] Desjardins, pt. ii. ch. 1.

[6] Suet. *Aug.* 41, 46; Dion Cass. li. 21; lviii. 2.

[7] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 87; vi. 13; xv. 18, 39; Suet. *Aug.* 41, 42, *Claud.* 18; Dion Cass. lxii. 18; Orelli, 3358, 3359; Henzen, 6662, 6663; see Lexic. *s. v. Tessera frumentaria.*

tous on these points,— small matters perhaps, but at times most pressing of all. In remote antiquity the world had, as we may say, no need of charity; it was then young and self-reliant, and for the hospital there was no demand. The simple morality of Homer, holding the guest or beggar as sent express from Jove,[1] is the morality of light-hearted and sturdy youths. Greece in the classic period enunciated the finest maxims of pity, beneficence, and humanity, without any reserve of social anxiety or sadness.[2] Man at this period was sound in health and easy in mind: he need take no account of evil. Greeks were far in advance of Romans in provisions for mutual help.[3] No liberal or charitable device went forth from that cruel oligarchy which throughout the time of the Republic held a power so oppressive. In the period which now concerns us, the colossal fortunes of the aristocracy, luxury, the heaping-up of great populations in crowded centres, — still more, the hardness of heart peculiar to the Romans, their loathing of pity,[4] had created the growth of pauperism. The indulgences lavished by some of the emperors upon the Roman mob had but made the matter worse. The alms-basket (*spatula*) and the bread-tickets (*tesseræ*) did but encourage vice and idleness, and brought no relief to misery. In this, as in many other things, the East was really far in advance of the Western world. The Jews had true charitable institutions. The Egyptian temples seem sometimes to have had a poor-box.[5] The

[1] *Odyss.* vi. 207.

[2] Eurip. *Suppl.* 773; Arist. *rhet.* ii. 8; *Eth. Nicom.* viii. 1; ix. 10; Stob. *Flor.* 37, 103; also Menander and the comedians (*gr.*).

[3] Arist. *Polit.* vi. 3:4, 5.

[4] Cic. *Tusc.* iv. 7, 8; Sen. *De Clem.* ii. 5, 6.

[5] Papyr. in the Louvre, 37; *Notices et extr.* xviii. pt. 2, 298.

monastic school of the Serapeum at Memphis (see p. 96) was, in a way, a charitable foundation. The awful crisis which mankind passed through in the imperial capital was little felt at a distance, where life had continued to be more simple. The charge of having poisoned the very soil, the likening of Rome to a harlot (Rev. xv. ii.) who has made the world drunken with the wine of her debauchery, had a certain truth. The province was really better than Rome; or rather, the impurities that flowed together at Rome from every side, as into a vast sewer, had created there a focus of infection, in which the old Roman virtues were smothered, while the good seed brought from abroad was slow in growth.

The intellectual condition of the Empire, in its several portions, was very defective, showing in this regard a real decline. High mental culture is not so independent of political conditions as is private morality, besides that the advance of the one is by no means on lines parallel with the other. Marcus Aurelius was doubtless a man of nobler character than any of the old Greek philosophers; but his scientific notions as to the facts of the universe were far behind those of Aristotle or Epicurus: he even had his times of believing in the gods as limited and distinct persons, in dreams and omens. During the Roman period the world experienced a growth in morals and a decline in science, a decline very apparent from the time of Tiberius to that of Nerva. Centuries before, with originality, force, and resources never equalled, Greek genius had created the cycle of rational study, the normal discipline of the mind. This wonderful achievement, dating from Thales and the early Ionic schools (600 B. C.), was nearly brought to a stop about 120 B. C. The last survivors of those

five centuries of genius[1] had died leaving no successors, unless it be Posidonius and a few astronomers, who kept alive the old traditions of Alexandria, Rhodes, and Pergamos. Greece, with all her genius to create, had gained from her science and philosophy neither popular enlightenment nor a defence against superstition. While in possession of admirable schools of science in Egypt and Asia Minor, Greece was herself a prey to the stupidest credulity. Now, when science does not succeed in dominating superstition, superstition will throttle science. Between these two opponents, the duel is to the death.

Italy, while adopting Greek science, had for a time inspired it with a new motive. Lucretius had composed the model of a great philosophic poem — at once a hymn and a blasphemy — which induced at once calmness and despair, pervaded by a deep feeling of human destiny that was always lacking to the Greeks. True children as they were, these took life so joyously that they never thought to speak ill of the gods, or to regard nature as unjust and treacherous to man. More sombre thoughts came to light among the Latin philosophers: but Rome had no more success than Greece in making science the basis of popular education. While Cicero, with fine tact, gave complete literary form to ideas borrowed from the Greeks, — while Lucretius composed his astonishing poem, — while Ovid, one of the most charming of poets, treated the most venerable myths like an elegant free-thinker, — while the great Stoics followed out the Greek philosophy to its practical results, — the wildest chimeras found belief, and

[1] Apollonius of Pergamos, Eratosthenes, Aristarchus, Hero, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Chrysippus, Carneades, Panætius.

faith in the marvellous had no bounds. Never was there a period more busied with oracles and prodigies.[1] The fine eclectic theism of Cicero, continued and completed by Seneca,[2] remained the profession of a few lofty souls, but had no influence whatever upon their time.

Before Vespasian, the Empire had nothing that could be called public instruction.[3] The latest in this kind was hardly more than dull grammatical exercises, which rather hastened than stayed the general decline. The last years of the Republic and the reign of Augustus witnessed one of the finest literary movements ever known. But after the death of this great emperor, the decline was rapid, nay, even abrupt. The cultivated intellectual circle of Cicero, Atticus, Cæsar, Mæcenas, Agrippa, Pollio, had vanished like a dream. No doubt there were still enlightened men in touch with the learning of their time, and high in social standing: such were the Senecas, and the literary circle of which they were the centre, — Lucilius, Gallio, and Pliny. The body of Roman Law, which is a codifying of philosophy itself, a reduction of Greek rational theory to practice, continued its majestic growth. The great Roman families had preserved a fund of lofty religion and a great horror of superstition.[4] The geographers Strabo and Pomponius Mela, the physician and encyclopædist Celsus, the botanist Dioscorides, the jurist Sempronius Proculus, were men of solid thought, but they

[1] Virg. *Ecl.* iv., *Geor.* i. 463; Hor. *Od.* i. 2; Tac. *Ann.* vi. 12; Suet. *Aug.* 31.

[2] *De Rep.* iii. 22, in Lact. *Inst. div.* vi. 8; Sen. *Ep.* 31.

[3] Suet. *Vesp.* 18; Dion Cass. vol. vi. 558 (ed. *Sturz*); Euseb. *Chron.* 89; Plin. *Ep.* i. 8; Orelli, 1172 (p. 124).

[4] Fun. disc. on Turia, i. 30, 31.

were only exceptions. Excepting a few thousand men of intelligence, the world was swamped in a complete ignorance of natural laws.[1] Credulity was a universal epidemic.[2] Literary culture was but a hollow rhetoric, which taught nothing. Larger speculations were shut off by the purely practical turn that philosophy had taken. Excepting in geography, there was no advance in knowledge. The place of the scientific originator was filled by the instructed and lettered amateur. Here the worst fault of the Romans made its deadly influence felt. This people, so grand in schemes of empire, was dwarfed in mind. The ablest of the Romans — Lucretius, Vitruvius, Celsus, Pliny, Seneca — were in positive knowledge but pupils of the Greeks; and too often it was but second-rate science that they imperfectly copied, — as we see in Manilius, Hyginus, and the translations of Aratus. Rome never had a great scientific school, and the reign of quackery was here almost unchecked. In fine, Latin literature, which certainly had some fine qualities, did not flourish long, and did not spread beyond the Western world, as Cicero himself declares (*Arch.* 10).

Happily, Greece remained true to her genius. She was dazzled, shut off, but not obliterated, by the amazing outburst of Roman power. In fifty years she renewed her conquest of the world, and, seated on the throne beside the Antonines, was again the mistress of all serious minds. But the present is a weary hour for Greece herself: genius is rare with her; in original science she is inferior to what she was in the centuries

[1] Val. Max. i.; Jul. Obs. on prodigies; Æl. Arist. *Disc. Sacr.*

[2] Even Augustus (Suet. *Aug.* 90–92) and Julius (Plin. *H. N.* 28:4, 7); but this may be doubted.

before, or will be in the century to follow. The school of Alexandria, more than two centuries in decline, yet still having Sosigenes in Cæsar's time, is now mute.

From Augustus to Trajan we must, then, recognise a period of abasement to the human mind. The ancient world had not yet spoken its last word; but its voice and its heart were quelled by the cruel strain it was now enduring. Let better days come, and the mind, set free from the baleful rule of the Cæsars, will seem to live again. The nobler days of Greece will return, — not, indeed, that inimitable Greece which lived once for the delight and despair of all lovers of the beautiful, but a Greece still rich and fertile, which, mingling her own gifts with those of Roman genius, will bring forth new fruits of her own native growth.[1]

This was an era of very bad taste. The greater Greek writers are found wanting, while the Latins whom we know, except the satirist Persius, are without genius and commonplace. All was spoiled by declamation. The general standard of literary judgment was much what it is now, — it looked only for brilliancy of effect. The word was no longer the simple vesture of the thought, elegant only as it perfectly expressed and fitted that, but was studied for its own sake. The author wrote to exhibit himself; at a public reading, or recitation, merit was estimated by the number of phrases that called out applause. The great maxim, that all in art should serve as ornament, but that all is bad which is specially meant for ornament, was totally forgotten. The time was, if you will, very literary.

1 The new intellectual leaders are Epictetus, Plutarch, Dion Chrysostom, Pliny the Younger, Juvenal, Rufus of Ephesus, Aretæus, Galen, Ptolemy, Hypsicles, Theon, Lucian.

All the talk was of eloquence, of good style; yet at bottom almost every one wrote ill, and there was not a single good orator, for a good orator or a good writer is a man who makes a trade of neither. In the theatre the chief actor had all the attention, and the drama was suppressed for the declamation of mere show-pieces (*cantica*). The literary temper was a silly *dilettantism*, which extended even to the emperor; a stupid vanity, which made it every one's aim to display his wit. Hence an exceeding insipidity, with long-winded "Theseids," plays made for reading in a coterie, commonplace versifying, which can be likened only to the classic epics and tragedies of sixty years ago.

Stoicism itself could not escape this evil, or devise a fair form for its doctrines, before Epictetus and Marcus Aurelius. Strange forms of tragedy, in truth, are those of Seneca, where the loftiest sentiments are uttered in the tiresome fashion of a literary charlatan, showing at once advance in ethical thinking and a hopeless decay of taste. So too with Lucan. The mental strain of the extremely tragic situation generates a swollen style, with the sole care to shine in fine phrases. Just so it was during our own French Revolution: the most violent crisis of all history succeeded in producing only a breed of declaimers and rhetoricians. We must not stop here. New thoughts sometimes take on a pretentious mode of utterance. Seneca's style is sober, simple, and pure when compared with Augustine's. But we pardon Augustine's frequently bad style and tasteless conceits for the sake of his noble thoughts.

This education, at all events, in many ways noble and distinguished, did not find its way to the people. This would have been a small evil if the people had

had some religious nurture, something like what the most forsaken classes among us find in the Church. But in all parts of the Empire religion was extremely debased. Rome was quite right in leaving the old worships unharmed, cutting away only what was cruel, seditious, or harmful to the others.[1] She had spread a sort of official varnish over them all, bringing them to a common likeness, and lumping them together for better or worse. Unhappily these old worships, very diverse in origin, had one thing in common, — it was alike impossible for them to devise theological instruction, or a helpful style of address, or a pastoral ministration, of real benefit to the people. The pagan temple was not at all what in their best estate the synagogue and church have been, — a house in common, a school, a place of shelter and hospitality, whither the poor may go for refuge.[2] The pagan temple was a cold, bare room (*cella*), where you hardly got in, and learned nothing. The Roman cult was perhaps least bad of all those still in use. At least, cleanness of heart and person, were regarded there as essential to religion.[3] In sobriety, decency, severity, this cult — apart from some farcical proceedings like our carnival — was superior to the strange and ludicrous ceremonies secretly brought in by people stricken with the various Oriental lunacies. Still it strikes us as childish, the affectation of the Roman patrician, in distinguishing "religion," that is, his own cult, from "superstition," that is, a foreign cult.[4] All pagan worships were essentially superstí-

[1] Suet. *Claud.* 25; Jos. *Ant.* xix. 5: 3.

[2] *Bereshith rabba*, 65: 65 *b*; Du Cange, *s. v. matricularius.*

[3] Cic. *De leg.* ii. 8; Vopiscus, *Aur.* 19.

[4] Thus, *religio sine superstitione* (fun. disc. on Turia, i. 30, 31; comp. Plutarch, *De superst.*).

tious. The peasant who to-day puts a penny in the poor-box of a miracle-mongering chapel, or invokes a special saint for his oxen or horses, or drinks water of a certain spring in certain maladies, is so far forth a pagan. Almost all superstitions among us are survivals of some religion anterior to Christianity, which it has not yet quite eradicated. If we would in our day find a true picture of the old paganism, it would be in some out-of-the-way village in the most backward districts.

The pagan worships, being protected only by an unsteady popular tradition and the priests' hired underlings, could not fail to degenerate into the basest superstition.[1] Augustus (though with reserve) consented to be worshipped in his own lifetime in the provinces.[2] That ignoble rivalry of the Asiatic cities, which contended together for the honour of erecting a temple to Tiberius, was by the emperor's command determined in his own presence.[3] The outrageous impieties of Caligula[4] led to no reaction; outside of Judaism, there was not one priest to withstand such insanities. The pagan worships had their roots in a primitive worship of natural powers, changed over and over by foreign mixtures, or by the popular imagination, and so were fettered by their past. A pure theism, or any moral lesson, could not be got out of them, having never been in them. The church Fathers make us

[1] See Melito, "Of truth," in Cureton's *Spicil. Syr.* ii. 41, for the impression made by this worship on Jews and Christians.

[2] Suet. *Aug.* 52; Dion Cass. li. 20; Tac. *Ann.* i. 10; Aur. Vict. *Cæs.* 1; App. *B. Civ.* v. 132; Jos. *War*, i. 21: 2, 3, 4, 7; Noris, *Cenot. Pis.* i. 4; *Kal. Cum.* in *Corp. inscr.* i. 310; Eckhel, *Doct. num. vet.* 2, vi. 109, 124.

[3] Tac. *Ann.* iv. 55, 56; Val. Max. *prol.*

[4] See above, p. 178.

laugh when they dilate on the misdeeds of Saturn as a father, or of Jupiter as a husband. But surely it was far more ludicrous to exalt Zeus (the heavenly æther) into a moral deity, who commands and forbids, rewards and punishes. What could a world that demanded a text-book of virtue do with such a worship as that of Venus, which had arisen from the social needs of early Phœnician voyagers in the Levant, but had grown by time into an outrage upon what was now more and more felt to be the true essence of religion?

There was manifest, in short, an energetic demand for a religion which should be the worship of One God, with a Divine Law as the basis of morality. Thus there came a time when society would no longer tolerate the cults of the nature-religions, which were degraded to mere childish follies, or the contortions of mountebanks; when mankind must have a moral and philosophic creed. To this demand Buddhism was the response in India, Zoroastrianism in Persia. The same thing had been attempted, with no lasting result, in the Greek world through Orphic mysteries and the like. At the date we have now reached, the whole world was confronted by the same problem, which was now stated with an impressive unanimity, and on a scale of imperial magnitude.

Greece, it is true, made an exception, religious thought being here less depleted than elsewhere in the Empire. Plutarch, in his little Bœotian town, still lived in his Hellenic faith, tranquil and happy, satisfied as a child, and with a perfectly calm religious conscience. With him we find not the smallest hint of crisis, or heart-rending, or anxiety, or sense of a coming revolution. But the Greek mind alone was capable of

so childlike a serenity. Greece, ever self-satisfied and self-sufficing, proud of her past and of the brilliant mythology whose shrines were all within her borders, shared not the inward struggles which burdened the rest of the world. She alone made no appeal to Christianity; she alone preferred to pass it by, claiming to have that which was better. Corinth, the only city in Greece that had a noticeable Christian element, was at this period not a city of Greeks. This was due to that perpetual youth, that love of country, that lightness of heart, which have always been marks of the true Greek spirit, and make the Greece of our day a stranger to the deep anxieties that undermine our peace. Thus the Hellenic spirit felt itself equal to the task of attempting a revival which no other religion of the Empire could think of doing. In the three succeeding centuries Hellenism did, in fact, as "Neo-Platonism," set itself up as an organised religion, having for doctrine a sort of compound of mythology with Greek philosophy; and this — with its wonder-working philosophers [Plotinus, Porphyry, and Iamblichus]; with its spiritualistic trances, or "ecstasies"; with its ancient sages turned revealers, and its legends of Pythagoras and Apollonius, — made a real rival to Christianity; and, though impotent to survive, yet proved the most dangerous obstruction that the religion of Jesus ever met upon its path.

But it was, as yet, under the Cæsars, too early for such an attempt. The first who essayed an alliance of philosophy and paganism — Euphrates of Tyre, Apollonius of Tyana, and Plutarch — belong to the end of the century. Euphrates of Tyre [about A. D. 120], is little known to us. The real life of Apollonius is so wrapped

in legend that we do not even know whether to rate him as a philosopher, a religious leader, or a quack. Plutarch is not so much an original thinker as a well-balanced mind that thinks to bring the world to harmony by making philosophy timid and religion half-reasonable. In him there is nothing of Porphyry or Julian. The Stoic attempts[1] at allegorical interpretations of old myths are very weak. Mysteries, like those of Bacchus — in which the immortality of the soul was taught by graceful symbols[2] — were limited to particular districts, and had no wide influence. Unbelief in the official religion was common in the educated class.[3] Politicians, who chiefly assumed to uphold the State religion, would jest at it in neat phrases.[4] The immoral maxim was openly maintained that religious fables are good only for the common people and should be kept up for them.[5] A useless precaution, since the popular faith itself was greatly shaken.[6]

From the accession of Tiberius a religious reaction may be perceived. The world seems terrified at the avowed scepticism of the first imperial reigns; and in advance of Julian's attempt, every superstition is fortified by State policy.[7] Valerius Maximus is the first

[1] Of Heraclides and Cornutus: Cic. *De nat. deorum*, iii. 23–25, 60, 62–64.

[2] Plut. *Consol.* 10; *De sera num. vind.* 22; Heuzey, *Miss. de Macéd.* 128; *Rev. archéol.* Apr. 1864, p. 282.

[3] Lucret. i. 63; Sallust, *Cat.* 52; Cic. *N. D.* ii. 24, 28; *De divin.* ii. 33, 35, 37; *De har. resp.; Tusc.* i. 16; Juv. ii. 149–152; Sen. *Epist.* 24, 17.

[4] *Sua cuique religio est, nostra nobis;* Cic. *Flacc.* 28.

[5] Cic. *N. D.* i. 30, 42; *Divin.* ii. 12, 33, 35, 72; *De har. resp.* 6; Liv. i. 19; Curt. iv. 10; Plut. *De plac. phil.* i. 7: 2; Diod. Sic. i. 2: 2; Varro (Aug. *Civ. Dei*, iv. 31. 32; vi. 6); Dion. Halic. ii. 20; viii. 5; Val. Max. i. 2.

[6] Cic. *Div.* ii. 15; Juv. ii. 449.

[7] Tac. *Ann.* xi. 15; Plin. *Ep.* x. 97; Serapion in Plut. *De Pyth. orac.* *EI* at Delphi; Val. Max. i. (throughout).

instance of a writer of low degree offering aid to theologians in distress, putting a venal or sullied pen at the service of religion. But the chief gainers were the foreign faiths. The serious reaction in favour of the Greco-Roman cult is left for the second century. At this time those impelled by religious anxieties turn to the religions of the East; Isis and Serapis are in higher favour than ever.[1] Impostors of all sorts, wonder-workers and magicians profit by the demand, and sprout up everywhere, as usual when and where the State religion is weak.[2] These blunders and chimeras were (so to speak) a prayer of the Earth in labour; fruitless efforts of a world seeking a rule of life, and in its convulsive strivings bringing forth monstrous births destined soon to be forgotten.

In short, the middle of the first century is one of the very worst periods of ancient history. Greek and Roman society appears declined from what there was before, and greatly in the rear of that which follows. But in the very greatness of the crisis was hidden some formation mysterious and strange. Life seems to have lost its motive; suicides abound.[3] No century had known such a conflict of good and evil. The evil was a formidable despotism which put the world into the hands of criminals and madmen; it was the corruption of morals resulting from the importation into Rome of the vices of the East; it was the lack of a good religion and a serious public instruction. The good was,

[1] Juv. vi. 489, 527; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; xi. 15; Lucian, *Ass. of gods;* Tert. *Apol.* 6; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3:4; Le Bas, *Inscr.* v. 395.

[2] Plut. *Pyth.* 25; Lucian, *Alexander*, *de morte Peregrini;* recall the real or fabulous examples of Apollonius of Tyana, Alexander of Abonoteichus, Peregrinus, and Simon Magus.

[3] Sen. *Ep.* 12, 24, 70; Insc. at Lanuvium, Orelli, 4404.

on the one hand, Philosophy fighting open-breasted against tyrants, defying monsters, thrice or four times proscribed in half a century, — under Nero, Vespasian, and Domitian; on the other hand, that effort on the part of popular virtue, those genuine aspirations to a better religious state, the impulse toward brotherhoods, a monotheistic worship, the reinstalment of the poor, — all these chiefly under the guise of Judaism and Christianity. These two great protests were far from being in accord. The philosophic and the Christian party did not understand each other; and they were so little aware of the common end they were both striving for that, when the philosophic party came to power with Nerva, it was far from friendly to Christianity. In truth, the Christian purpose was far more radical. When the Stoics were masters of the Empire, they reformed it, and reigned through a hundred of the most beneficent years in human history. When the Christians became masters of the Empire with Constantine, they completed its ruin. Heroism on one part should not blind us to heroism on the other. Christianity, always unjust to pagan virtues, assumed the task of disparaging those who had fought the same enemies with itself. The stand taken by philosophy in the first century was as grand as that of Christianity; but how unequally were they rewarded! The martyr who overthrew the idols has his place in the Christian martyrology. Why has not the true hero of paganism his image among the popular heroes loved and honoured by all? — Annæus Cornutus, who openly told Nero that the tyrant's books were inferior to those of the Stoic Chrysippus;[1] Helvidius Priscus, who said

[1] Dion Cass. lxii. 29.

before Vespasian, "It is for thee to kill, for me to die;"[1] Demetrius the Cynic, who replied to Nero when angry, "You threaten me with death, but Nature threatens you the same."[2] Is humanity so rich in the forces arrayed against vice and ignominy, that each school of virtue may freely reject the aid of the others, and claim to itself the sole right to be valiant, high-tempered, or resigned?

[1] Arrian, *Epict.* i. 2 : 21. [2] *Ibid.* i. 25 : 22.

CHAPTER XVIII.

LAWS AFFECTING RELIGION — A. D. 45.

The Empire in the first century, while unfriendly to the religious novelties coming from the East, did not as yet contend against them by any fixed policy. The maxim that the State has its religion was quite feebly upheld. Foreign rites had been several times proscribed under the Republic, particularly those of Sabazius the Phrygian, Bacchus, Isis the Egyptian, and Serapis.[1] This was wholly useless. The people were drawn as by irresistible attraction to these worships.[2] When by public decree the temple of Isis and Serapis was ordered to be demolished (A. U. C. 535), a workman could not be found to undertake the work, and the consul was obliged to break in the door with an axe.[3] Evidently the crowd were not content with the Latin ritual. There is reason to believe that Cæsar restored these fanes to humour the popular desires.[4]

With his own profound and liberal mental grasp, this great man thus proved himself in favour of complete liberty of conscience.[5] Augustus was more constant to the national religion.[6] He was prejudiced

[1] Val. Max. i. 3; Liv. xxxix. 8–18; Cic. *Leg.* ii. 8; Dion. Hal. ii. 20; Dion Cass. xl. 47; xlii. 26; Tert. *Apol.* 6; *Adv. nat.* i. 10.

[2] Prop. iv. 1 : 17; Luc. viii. 831, Dion Cass. xlvii. 15; Arnob. ii. 73.

[3] Val. Max. i. 3 : 3.

[4] Dion Cass. xlvii. 15.

[5] Jos. xiv. 10; Cic. *Flacc.* 28.

[6] Suet. *Aug.* 31, 93; Dion Cass. liii. 36.

against the Eastern rites; he even forbade the practice of Egyptian ceremonies in Italy;[1] but he insisted that each religion, the Jewish in particular, should be master in its own country.[2] He exempted Jews from anything that could offend their conscience, in particular, any civil action on the Sabbath.[3] Some of those about him had less tolerance, and would have made him a religious persecutor to the benefit of the Latin cult,[4] but to these evil counsels he seems not to have given way. Josephus (perhaps with some straining of the truth) holds that he made gifts of sacred vessels to the temple at Jerusalem.[5]

Tiberius was the first to lay down clearly the maxim of a religion of State, and to oppose serious checks to Jewish and Oriental propaganda.[6] The emperor, it should be borne in mind, was the chief pontiff; and in protecting the old Roman worship, he might seem to be merely discharging an official duty. Caligula cancelled the edicts of Tiberius, but his insanity permitted no consecutive policy. Claudius seems to have continued the policy of Augustus: he confirmed the Latin ritual, gave much attention to the progress of foreign religions, was severe toward the Jews, and sharply prosecuted the "brotherhoods."[7] In Judæa, on the other hand, his policy was friendly to the Jews.[8] The

[1] Dion Cass. liv. 6.
[2] Jos. *Ant.* xvi. 6.
[3] *Ibid.* xvi. 6: 2.
[4] Dion Cass. lii. 36.
[5] Jos. *War*, v. 13: 6; Suet. *Aug.* 93.
[6] Suet. *Tib.* 36; Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3: 4, 5; Philo, *Flacc.* 1; *Leg.* 24; Sen. *Ep.* 108: 22. We need not discuss seriously the alleged intention of Tiberius to put Jesus Christ on the list of gods, stated by Tertullian (*Apol.* 5), and repeated by other ecclesiastical writers.
[7] Dion Cass. lx. 6; Tac. *Ann.* xi. 15; Suet. *Claud.* 25; Acts xviii. 2.
[8] Jos. *Ant.* xix. 5: 2; xx. 6: 3; *War*, ii. 12: 7.

personal favour enjoyed at Rome by the Agrippas under these two reigns ensured a powerful protection to their co-religionists, except as against breaches of the public peace.

Nero gave little heed to questions of religion.[1] His hateful acts against the Christians proceeded from ferocity of temper, not maxims of policy.[2] Alleged cases of persecution in Roman society at this time were due less to public than to family authority;[3] and besides, such things occurred only in the noble houses that were true to the old traditions.[4] Each province was perfectly free to follow its own religion, on condition of not molesting others.[5] Provincials in Rome had the same right, in case they made no open scandal. Druidism and Judaism, the only two religions assailed by the Empire in the first century, were bulwarks of old nationalities. Every one assumed that the profession of Judaism was a mark of contempt for civil law and indifference to the welfare of the State;[6] as long as it consented to be simply a personal faith, there was no persecution. Penalties denounced against the worship of Serapis came perhaps from its monotheist guise, which caused it to be ranked along with the Jewish and Christian creeds.[7]

[1] Suet. *Nero*, 56.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Suet. *Nero*, 16. This will be further considered hereafter. See "Antichrist."

[3] Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 32.

[4] Dion Cass. (Xiph.) *Domit.* (end); Suet. *Dom.* 15; see the formal distinction in *Digest*, xlvii. 22 : 1, 3.

[5] Cic. *Flacc.* 28; see Acts xvi. 20, 21; xviii. 13.

[6] Cic. *Flacc.* 28; Juv. xiv. 100; Tac. *Hist.* v. 4, 5; Plin. *Ep.* x. 97; Dion Cass. lii. 36; Jos. *War*, vii. 5 : 2.

[7] Æl. Arist. *Pro Serap.* 53; Julian, *Or.* iv. 136; Leblant: *Bull. de la Soc. des. Antiq.* 1859, pp. 191–195 (on certain sculptured stones). Tac. *Ann.* ii. 85; Suet. *Tib.* 36; Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 3 : 4, 5; Adrian, *Ep.* in Vopiscus, *Vit. Saturn.* 8; Dion Cass. xxxvii. 17.

ST. ALBERT'S COLLEGE LIBRARY

Thus in the time of the apostles, there was no statute-law against the profession of a monotheistic faith. Such faiths, until the coming-in of the Syrian emperors, were always watched; but it was not till the time of Trajan that they were persecuted on system, as hostile to the others, as intolerant, and as implying the negation of the State. In a word, what the Empire made war against was theocracy. Its maxim was, a secular State; it did not consent that a religion should involve any civil or political consequences whatever; especially it did not tolerate any association, within the State, above or independent of the State. This is the essential point: it is, in fact, the root of every persecution. The fatal source of the violent acts that disgrace the reigns of the best emperors was not religious intolerance, but the policy of suppressing secret societies ("brotherhoods").

Greece was in advance of Rome, as in all matters of taste and delicacy, so in the matters of associations. The Greek brotherhoods (*eranoi*, *thiasoi*) of Athens, Rhodes, and the Archipelago, had been excellent associations for mutual help, credit, fire-insurance, acts of piety, or innocent enjoyment.[1] Each society (ἔρανος) had its rules graven on marble slabs, its records, and its common chest supplied by assessments or voluntary gifts. The members (*eranists* or *thiasites*) kept certain holidays together, and met for banquets full of cor-

[1] See inscr. in *Rev. archéol.*, Nov. 1864, p. 397; Dec. 1864, p. 460; June, 1865, pp. 451, 452, 497, 498; Sept. 1865, 214, 215; Apr. 1866; Ross, *inscr. gr.* ii. 282, 291, 292; Hamilton, *Res. in Asia Minor*, ii. 301; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 120, 126, 2525, 2562; Rhangabé, *Ant. hell.* 811; Henzen, 6082; Virg. *Ecl.* v. 30; Harpocr. *Lex. s. v.* ἐρανιστής; Festus: *thiasitas*· *Dig.* 47 : 22; Plin. *Ep.* x. 93, 94.

diality.[1] A member in straits for money could borrow of the common fund with obligation to repay. Women might be members, with their separate prescribing officer (*proéranistria*). The meetings were strictly private, in which order was enforced by strict rules; and they seem to have been held in closed gardens, surrounded by porches or low structures, while an altar for sacrifice stood in the midst.[2] Each society, again had a body of officers annually chosen by lot (κληρωτοί), like the old Greek democracies, from whom the Christian *clergy* (clerus) may have taken their name.[3] Only the president was elected. These officers subjected the applicant to some sort of test, and had to certify that he was "pious, righteous, and good."[4] During the two or three centuries before our era there was a movement among these societies like that which led to the founding of so many religious orders, or sub-orders. As many as nineteen were reckoned in the island of Rhodes alone,[5] several bearing the names of the founders or revivers. Some, especially those of Bacchus, had elevated doctrines, intended to give comfort to "men of good will." If some little love, piety, and devout morality still survived among the Greeks, it was

[1] Arist. *Eth. Nic.* viii. 9:5; Plut. *Greek Questions*, 44.

[2] Wescher, *Arch. des miss. scient.* ser. 2:i. 432; *Rev. arch.*, Sept. 1865, 221, 222; Arist. *Œkonom.* ii. 3; Strabo, ix. 1:15; *Corp. inscr. gr.* 2271, 13, 14.

[3] Κλῆρος: the ecclesiastical etymology is different, and implies some allusion to the post held by the tribe of Levi, but the word was probably borrowed as above (Acts i. 25, 26; 1 Pet. v. 3; Clem. Alex. in Eus. iii. 23). The Greek societies had also an overseer (*episcopus: Rev. arch.* Apr. 1866, 216; Pollux, ix. 8:143), and were sometimes called *synagogues* (see above, chap. v.).

[4] *Corp. inscr. gr.* 126; *Rev. arch.* Sept. 1865, 215.

[5] *Rev. arch.* Dec. 1864, 460.

due to the liberty of these private worships, which made a sort of rivalry with the official religion, that was manifestly declining day by day.

At Rome similar associations met more obstacles,[1] but no less favour among the poorer classes. Roman policy as to them was first set forth under the Republic, in dealing with the Bacchanals (B. C. 186). The Romans were naturally much inclined to these friendly societies, particularly to such as were religious;[2] but permanent associations of this character were displeasing to the patrician holders of public authority, who, in their dry and narrow notion of life, accepted no social groups but the Family and the State. The most minute precautions were taken; a permit must be previously granted; the number of members was prescribed; there must be no permanent master of ceremonies (*magister sacrorum*), nor a common fund to be raised by subscription.[3] The same anxious jealousy reappears at intervals under the Empire; the body of laws contained texts for every form of repression,[4] which might be used or not at will. A proscribed worship might reappear within a few years.[5] Foreign immigration, too, especially from Syria, constantly renewed the material from which these vainly resisted faiths were fed.

It is amazing to see how the strongest heads were

[1] What these were among the Greeks, see inscr. in *Rev. arch.*, Dec. 1864, 462.

[2] See *Digest*, xlvii. 22; *De coll. et corp.* 4.

[3] Dion Cass. lii. 36; lx. 6; Liv. xxxix. 8–18; see decree in *Corp. inscr. lat.* i. 43, 44; Cic. *Leg.* ii. 8.

[4] Cic. *Sext.* 25; *In Pis.* 4; Ascon. *In Corn.* 75 (Orelli); *In Pison.* 7, 8; Dion Cass. xxxviii. 13, 14; *Dig.* iii. 4; xlvii. 22.

[5] Suet. *Dom.* 1; Dion Cass. xlvii. 15; lx. 6; lxvi. 24; Tert. and Arnob. (as above).

disturbed by a matter that looks so insignificant. It was a chief care with Julius and Augustus to prevent the forming of new societies (*collegia*) and to abolish those already existing.[1] A decree, passed apparently under Augustus, tried to define clearly the limits of the right of association, and these were very narrow. The *collegia* must be strictly burial-societies. They could meet only once a month; they might attend only to the burial of deceased members; and under no pretext could they enlarge the range of their functions.[2] The Empire was striving for the impossible. Following up its exaggerated notion of the State, it sought to isolate the individual, to break every moral tie among men, to contend against a just desire of the poor — that of shutting themselves in together, to keep one another warm. In ancient Greece the city was very tyrannical; but, in exchange for its petty vexations, it gave so much pleasure, brightness, and glory, that no one thought of making a complaint. Her children died for her with joy, and underwent her most unjust caprices without a murmur. The Roman Empire was too vast to be a fatherland. It offered great material advantages to all, but gave nothing to win their love. The unendurable gloom of such a life seemed worse than death.

Thus, notwithstanding all the efforts of men in power, the associations widely throve and flourished. They made an exact parallel to the guilds and brotherhoods of the Middle Age, with their patron saint and their festivals in common. Great families had a great

[1] Suet. *Jul.* 42; *Aug.* 32; Jos. *Ant.* xiv. 10 : 8; Dion Cass. lii. 36.

[2] Inscr. of Lanuvium: Mommsen, *De coll.*, etc., 81, 82; *Digest*, xlvii. 22; Tert. *Apol.* 39.

name to care for, had their country and their tradition; but the poor and lowly had nothing but their brotherhood (*collegium*). In this was all their joy. All authorities show us these societies and clubs (*cœtus*) as made of slaves, veterans, and people of small means (*tenuiores*).[1] In these was full equality as between the free-born and freedmen or those in servile condition; and many women were included.[2] A thousand annoyances might be risked, or the sharpest penalties; still they were eager to join some one of these associations, in which they lived in pleasant fraternal fashion, found mutual aid and comfort, and entered into relations that did not end even with death.[3] The place of meeting (*schola collegii*) commonly had a porch on four sides (*tetrastyle*)[4] in which, beside the altar to the Divine protector, were posted the rules of the society, and a dining-table (*triclinium*) for the banquet. These banquets were impatiently looked forward to; they took place on the festal day of the Protector or on the anniversary-day of some generous founder. Each brought his share in a little basket; and the members in turn furnished the accompaniments, such as couches, table-furniture, bread, wine, relishes (*sardines*), and hot water.[5] A large jar (*amphora*) of fine wine was due from a

[1] Inscr. Lan. 2 : 3, 7; *Dig.* 47 : 11, 22 (*De coll. et corp.* 1, 3).

[2] Heuzey, *Miss. de Macéd.* 71; Orelli, 4093, 2409; Melchiorri et Visconti, *Silloge d' iscriz. ant.* 6.

[3] See, concerning the *collegia* of Æsculapius and Hygeia, of Jupiter Cernenus, Diana, and Antinous, Mommsen, pp. 93, 96, 113, 114; Orelli, 1710, 2394, 2395, 2413, 4075, 4079, 4107, 4207, 4938, 5044; Rossi *Bull. di arch. crist.* ii. 8.

[4] Inscr. Lan. i. 6, 7; Orelli, 2270, 4420; Rossi, ii. 11–13.

[5] Inscr. Lan. 1 : 3–9, 21; 2 : 7–17; Mommsen (*Neap.*) 2559; *De coll. et sod.* 109, 113; Marini, *Atti*, 398; Muratori, 491, 7; 1 Cor. xi. 20–32; the leader in Christian assemblies was called *thiasarch* (Lucian, *Peregr.* 11).

newly emancipated slave.[1] The banquet was enlivened by mild gaiety; it was an express rule that no business of the society should be discussed, that nothing might disturb the short respite of gaiety and repose which these poor people managed to secure. Every act of rudeness or unpleasant word was punished by a fine.[2]

In outward appearance, these *collegia* were only joint-stock burial societies.[3] This was needed to assure the morality of their intent. In the Roman period, as at all times when the power of religion is lessened, reverence for graves is almost the only remaining form of popular piety. One was glad to think that he should not be cast into the horrible common pit,[4] that his burial would be cared for by the society, and that the brothers who came on foot to the grave would receive the petty fee (*funeraticium*) of about five cents. A slave, especially, needed to believe that, in case his master should cast his body on the refuse-heap, there would be friends to render the due image-rites.[5] The poor man, once a month, would put his penny in the common box, so as to ensure, after his death, a little urn in a *columbarium* [the collection of "pigeon-holes" for such urns], with a slab of marble bearing his name. Burial among the Romans was closely connected with the family rites (*sacra gentilitia*), and thus was held to be of extreme importance. Persons buried together thus attained a certain tie of brotherhood or kinship.[6]

[1] Inscr. Lan. 2:7.

[2] *Ibid.* 2:24, 26–29; *insc. gr.* 126.

[3] Orelli, 2399, 2400, 2405, 4093, 4103; Mommsen, *De coll.* 97. Comp. the little burial-places held now at Rome by similar societies.

[4] Hor. *Sat.* i. 8:8.

[5] Inscr. Lan. 1:24, 25, 32; 2:3–5.

[6] Cic. *Off.* i. 47; *Arch.* x. 1 (schol.); Plut. *De frat. am.* 7; *Digest*, xlvii.

Thus Christianity at Rome long presented the likeness of a burial-society, and the first Christian shrines were the tombs of martyrs.[1] If it had been only that, it would not have provoked such severities. But it was much more than that: it had its common funds;[2] it claimed a complete civic constitution; it felt itself assured of the future. When on Saturday evening we enter the enclosure of a Greek church in Turkey,— for instance, that of St. Photini at Smyrna, — we are struck with the power of these committee-religions in the heart of a persecuting or at least hostile community. The irregular piling together of buildings (church, presbytery, school, and prison), — the faithful going to and fro in their little pent-up town; the freshly opened tombs, each with its lighted lamp, giving out a deathly odour, at once damp and mouldy; the low murmur of prayers, the appeals for charity,— all these make together an atmosphere warm and soft, which may be at times oppressive to a stranger, but is doubtless soothing to those who find in it the atmosphere of their religious home.

The associations we have considered, when once secured by a special charter, had all the rights of civil persons at Rome.[3] But permission was not granted without numberless reservations when there was a common fund, or when anything besides burial

22 (*De coll. et corp.*). In an inscription at Rome, the endower of a burial-place stipulates that those there interred shall be of his religion (Rossi, *Bull.* iii. 7: 54).

[1] Tert. *Ad Scap.* 3; Rossi, iii. 12.

[2] Just. *Apol.* i. 67; Tert. *Apol.* 39.

[3] Ulp. *fr.* 22: 6; *Digest*, 3: 4; 46: 1; 47: 2, 21, 22 (*De coll. et corp.*); Gruter, 322: 3, 4; 424: 12; Orelli, 4080; Marini, 95; Muratori, 516: 1; *Soc. des Antiq. de Fr.* 1, *Mém.* xx. 78.

was had in view.[1] Any pretext of religion or the fulfilment of a common vow is anticipated and formally denoted as illegal;[2] a direct affront to the supreme power (an offence of the nature of treason), at least in the original founder of the society.[3] Claudius went so far as to close the eating-houses where such meetings were held, and to prohibit the places of refreshment where poor people could buy cheaply hot water and broth.[4] The best emperors, including Trajan, regarded all such associations with suspicion.[5] Those to whom the right was granted must be of very humble life, and even then it was with many restrictions.[6] Those who codified the Roman laws, while eminent as jurists, showed how ignorant they were of human nature by incessantly prosecuting an eternal need of the soul, even with threats of death, and restricting it by all manner of hateful or childish precautions.[7] Like the compilers of the modern Civil Code, they were as cold as death in their conception of life. If life consisted in amusing one's self by word of command, in eating one's bit of bread and taking one's diversion in the ranks, under the eye of his commanding officer, this conception of it might be intelligible. But a community that lets itself be governed by this false and

[1] *Digest*, xlvii. 22 (throughout); Inscr. Lan. 1 : 10–13; Marini, *Atti*, 552; Muratori, 520 : 3; Orelli, 4075, 4115, 1567, 2797, 3140, 3913; Henzen, 6633, 6745; Mommsen, p. 80 *et seq.*

[2] *Digest*, 47 : 11; *De extr. crim.* 2.

[3] *Ibid.* 47 : 22; 48 : 4.

[4] Dion Cass. lx. 6; Suet. *Nero*, 16.

[5] See the correspondence in Plin. *Ep.* x. 43, 93, 94, 97, 98.

[6] See *Digest*, 47 : 22; Plin. *Ep.* x. 94; Tert. *Apol.* 39.

[7] *Dig.* 1 : 12; 1 : 14; 3 : 4; 47 : 20; 34 : 5, 20; 40 : 3, 1; 47 : 22, 1; Mommsen, 127; Marcus Aurelius, on the other hand, enlarged the liberty of association as far as he could.

narrow notion finds its penalty, first in a weariness of life itself (*ennui*), and then in the violent triumph of the religious reaction. Man will never willingly breathe that icy air; he must have the little secluded quarter, where he and his may live and die together. Our great political communities are not competent to respond to all the social instincts of mankind. Let one set his heart on something, seek his solace where he may find it, gather brothers about him, and form a fellowship of hearts. Let not the cold hand of the State intervene in this realm of souls, which is the realm of freedom. Life and joy will not be reborn in the world until the distrust of associations, our sad inheritance from the Roman law, has passed away. The capital question for the future is that of association without the State, which shall not be the ruin of the State. The law of the future as to this will decide whether the modern world will or will not have the fate of the ancient. One example should be enough: the Roman Empire staked its existence on the law as to illicit clubs, illicit associations. Christian and barbarian broke down that law, so doing the work of the human conscience. The Empire which staked its existence on that law went down with it.

The Greek and Roman world, a world secular and profane, which knew nothing of the priest, which had no divine law and no book of revealed truth, here met a problem that it could not solve. And further, if it had had priests, a strict theology, a religion strongly organized, it would not have created the secular State, or inaugurated the idea of a rational society, founded on simple human needs, and on the natural relations of men with one another. That the Greeks and Romans

were religiously so inferior was because they were politically and intellectually superior. Judaism and primitive Christianity held in themselves the overthrow, or rather the putting under guardianship, of the political community. As in Islamism, so with them, society was built upon religion. If we take hold upon human affairs from that direction, we establish great systems of universal conversion ; we have apostles who run to the ends of the earth with the purpose of converting it. But we do not build political institutions, or found national independence, or create a dynasty, a code, or a people.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE FUTURE OF MISSIONS. — A. D. 45.

We have now briefly surveyed the condition of the world which Christian missionaries had taken in hand to convert. We may now see, as I think, that the task was not one of unreason, and that its success was not a miracle. The world was toilworn by moral needs, which found an admirable response in the new religion. Manners were softening; a purer worship was in demand; the thought of Human Rights, of social amelioration, was gaining ground on all sides. And, on the other hand, the general mind was extremely credulous; the number of trained intelligences was very small. If apostles of ardent conviction — Jews, worshippers of one God, disciples of Jesus, penetrated by the most persuasive moral discourse that the ear of man had ever heard — if such messengers come before such a world, they will surely have a hearing. The dreams and visions mingled in their instruction will do no harm: there are very few who do not already believe in the supernatural; and, if the hearers are humble and poor, so much the better. Mankind, at this crisis, cannot be saved but by a movement that comes from the heart of the people. The old pagan religions are past reforming; the Roman State is what it always will be, — stiff, dry, upright, and unyielding. In a world perishing for lack of love, the future is assured to him who shall touch

the living spring of popular piety. Greek liberalism and the old Roman gravity are to that end alike and utterly powerless.

The founding of Christianity is, in this view, the grandest work that was ever accomplished by the common people. It is true that some men and women of the highest families very early connected themselves with the Church. Toward the end of the first century, Flavius Clemens and Flavia Domitilla show us Christianity as already domiciled, almost, in the palace of the Cæsars.[1] From the time of the first Antonines [A. D. 140] persons of wealth are members of the community; and, toward the end of the second century, it contained some of the highest dignitaries of the Empire.[2] But at first all, or almost all, were of humble life.[3] The high-born and powerful were not found in the earliest churches, any more than among the followers of Jesus in Galilee. The glory of religions belongs exclusively to their founders. They are, in fact, a matter of pure faith. Mere belief is a commonplace affair; the masterpiece is his who has the skill to inspire faith.

When we try to fancy to ourselves these wondrous beginnings, we commonly shape them after the fashion of our day, and thus are betrayed into serious mistakes. A man of the people in the first Christian century was

[1] Rossi, *Bull.* iii. 3, 5, 6, 12. The case of Pomponia Græcina, under Nero (Tac. *Ann.* xiii. 32: see "Antichrist," p. 32), is here in point; but it is not certain that she was a Christian.

[2] Rossi, *Roma Sotterr.* i. 309; pl. 21: 12; and epigraphs deciphered by Léon Renier, in *Comptes rendus de l'acad. des inscr.*, etc., 1865, 289; and by General Creuly in *Rev. arch.* Jan. 1866, 63, 64; Rossi, *Bull.* iii. 10: 77–79.

[3] 1 Cor. i. 26–31; Jas. ii. 5–9.

nothing like what a man of the people is to-day. Education had not, at that time, drawn so sharp a line of class distinction as now exists. The Mediterranean races — setting aside the Latin populations, which had lost their importance and passed out of sight ever since the Roman Empire, by conquering the world, had become the property of the conquered — were less vigorous than ours, but more light of heart, more vivacious, quick-witted, and idealistic. The poor with whom we have here to do were not weighted with the heavy materialism of our lowest classes, did not exhibit that dull and blotted outlook, the dire effect of our climate and the evil legacy of the Middle Age, which gives so desolating an aspect to our poor. Though very ignorant and very credulous, they were not much more so than the rich and powerful. We must not, then, imagine the establishing of Christianity as anything like what it would be with us, if a similar popular movement should at length gain the adherence of the cultivated, — a thing which we cannot conceive as possible. The founders of Christianity were men of the common people, in the sense that they were clad in the common fashion, lived in very simple style, and spoke incorrectly, seeking only to give lively expression to their thought. But intellectually they were the inferiors of only a very few, daily becoming fewer, who survived from the great days of Julius and Augustus Cæsar. As compared with the select class of thinkers who made a chain of thought between the age of Augustus and that of the Antonines, the first Christians were indeed of weak intelligence; but, compared with the masses of the Empire, they were men of light. They were sometimes even treated as free-thinkers; and the popular cry against them was,

"Death to the atheists!"[1] And this is not strange. The world was making fearful progress in superstition. The first two capitals of Gentile Christianity, Antioch and Ephesus, were of all cities of the Empire, the two most given to supernatural beliefs. The second and third centuries carried credulity and craving for the marvellous to very imbecility.

Christianity had its birth outside the official world, but not exactly beneath it. It is only on an outside view, or by vulgar prejudice, that the disciples of Jesus are reckoned as of the lower class. A man of the world likes what is proud and strong; honour, as he understands it, consists in not submitting to an insult. He despises one who confesses himself weak, who suffers all, submits to all, gives his coat to him that asketh, and holds his cheek to the smiter. This is a mistake of his; for the weak one whom he scorns is commonly his superior: the sum-total of virtue with those who obey — serving-women, workmen, soldiers, sailors, and the like — is greater than with those who command and enjoy. And this is almost the regular course of things; for authority and enjoyment, far from being aids to virtue, are really a hindrance.

Jesus saw with wonderful clearness that in the popular heart is the great treasury of devotion and resignation for the saving of the world. Hence his declaration, "Happy are the poor," seeing that it is easier for them than for others to be good. The first Christians were characteristically of the poor. Their very name was "the poor" (*ebionim*).[2] Even when the

[1] Αἶρε τοὺς ἀθέους: *Martyrd. of Polycarp*, 3, 9, 12; Ruinart, *Acta sincera*, 31, 32.

[2] See "Life of Jesus," pp. 209–215, comparing Jas. ii. 5–10, and Matt. v. 3.

Christian was rich, in the second and third centuries, he was in spirit a *tenuior*;[1] he found security in the law authorising associations among the poor (*collegia tenuiorum*). The Christians were doubtless not all slaves, or people of low condition; but "slave" was the social equivalent of "Christian"; what might be said of a slave might be said of a Christian. With both, the same virtues were held in honour, — kindness, humility, resignation, gentleness. The testimony of pagan writers is unanimous upon this point. All, without exception, see in the Christian the qualities of the slave, — indifference to great affairs, a sad and contrite air, harsh judgment of the age, aversion for games, theatres, the gymnasium, and the public bath.[2]

In short, pagans were "the world," Christians were "not of the world." They were a little company apart, hated by the world, finding it an evil place,[3] seeking to "keep themselves unspotted from the world." Thus the Christian ideal will be the opposite of the worldly.[4] The perfect Christian will love his lowly condition; he will love the virtue of the poor and simple, of him who seeks not his own advantage. But he will have the defects of his merits; he will declare many things to be idle and vain which are not so; he will belittle the universe; will hate or despise mere beauty. A view of things in which a Venus of Milo is only an idol is a false or at any rate a partial view, for the beautiful is almost as precious as the good and the true. With such

[1] See p. 290, above.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* xv. 44; Plin. *Ep.* x. 97; Suet. *Nero*, 16; *Dom.* 15; *Philopatris;* Rutil. Num. i. 389, 440 *et seq.*

[3] John xv. 17–20; xvi. 8, 33; xvii. 17, 18; Jas. i. 27.

[4] This is spoken of primitive Christianity, not of Christianity as now preached by Jesuits and others, — a wholly different thing.

a view, Art must needs degenerate. The Christian will take no account of good building, carving, or drawing; he is too much a man of ideas. He will make little account of knowledge; curiosity seems to him a vain thing. Confounding the great joy of the soul, which is one way of laying hold upon the infinite, with vulgar pleasure, he will forbid himself its enjoyment. He is "righteous overmuch."

Another law here begins to be visible, as destined to rule in our history. The establishment of Christianity corresponds with the suppression of political life in the Mediterranean system. Christianity grows and spreads at a time when there is no more a fatherland. Patriotism is one thing wholly wanting to the founders of the Church. They are not cosmopolitan; for all the earth is to them a place of exile; they are idealists in the most absolute sense. Our native land is to us both body and soul: the soul consists in common memories, customs, legends, sorrows, hopes, and sense of loss; the body, in the soil, race, language, mountains, streams, and products native to the soil. Never was a creature more detached from all that than the early Christians. They have no attachment to Judæa; they have quickly forgotten Galilee; the glory of Greece or Rome is naught to them. The lands where Christianity first got a footing — Syria, Cyprus, Asia Minor — had no memory of a time when they had been free. Greece and Rome still had a strong national feeling; but at Rome, patriotism survived only in the army and in a few families, while in Greece Christianity bore fruit only at Corinth which was a mere conglomerate of every race since its destruction by Mummius (B. C. 146) and its rebuilding by Augustus. The regions truly

Greek — then as now very jealous of one another, and absorbed in the memories of their past — gave little heed to the new gospel, and were always lukewarm in their Christian profession. Asia and Syria, on the other hand, those countries of softness, gaiety, and sensual delight, of free morals and unrestraint, accustomed to receive life and government from elsewhere, had nothing to lose in the way of local pride and old tradition. The oldest capitals of Christianity, Antioch, Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, and Rome — were (so to speak) conglomerate cities, like modern Alexandria, whither all races gather, where the marriage of man and land which makes a nation was utterly broken off.

The importance allowed to social questions is always in inverse ratio to that bestowed on politics. As patriotism weakens, so socialism predominates. Christianity was a bursting-forth of social and religious ideas, which might well have been anticipated when Augustus put an end to political warfare. Christianity is a universal faith, like Islamism, and must prove the natural enemy of nationalities. It is a task of centuries and of many a schism to form a National Church, with a religion which was at the beginning a complete denial of an earthly country; which came to birth at a time when the world no longer had either cities or citizens; which the hard and sturdy old republics of Italy and Greece would certainly have expelled as a deadly poison to the State.

This was, in truth, one reason of the grandeur of the new faith. Humanity is a thing of variety and change, drawn this way and that by contradictory desires. Great is the Fatherland, and holy are the names of the heroes at Marathon, Thermopylæ, Valmy, and

Fleurus.[1] And yet our country is not the only thing on earth. A man is a man, a child of God, before he is a Frenchman or a German. The kingdom of God, an eternal dream that will never be banished from the heart of man, is the protest against a too exclusive patriotism. The thought of an organisation of mankind, to ensure its greatest welfare and its moral betterment, is a legitimate and Christian thought. The State knows and can know but one thing — the organisation of self-interest. This is not a thing indifferent, for self-regard is the strongest and most accessible of human motives. But this is not enough. Governments that set out on the theory that man is made up only of selfish interests have deceived themselves. To a man of high race devotion is as natural as self-interest; and the organising of devotion is religion. Let there be no hope, then, of dispensing with religion, or religious associations. Every step of progress in modern societies will make this need the more imperative.

Thus these stories of far-off events may be full of instruction and of example for us. We must not stop short with certain features which look strange to us through difference of time. When we have to do with popular beliefs, there is always a vast disproportion between the grandeur of the ideal which faith aims at, and the pettiness of the material circumstances that may have induced the faith. Hence this peculiarity: that in religious history all that is most sublime may be mingled with shocking details and acts that look like madness. The monk who invented [the fable of] the holy flask (*ampulla*) [of Rheims] was one of the

[1] Here the independence of Holland was finally secured in 1622. — Ed.

founders of the kingdom of France. Who would not blot from the life of Jesus the story of the demoniacs [and the swine] at Gergasa (Matt. viii. 28–38)? No sane man ever did what was done by St. Francis, Joan of Arc, Peter the Hermit, or Ignatius Loyola. Nothing is more variable in meaning than the word "unreason" as applied to past phases of the human mind. If we follow the ideas current in our day there was never a prophet, apostle, or saint, who should not have been shut up in an asylum. Human thought is very unsteady where reflection is not in an advanced stage; in such conditions of thought good and evil change places by insensible degrees, and so too with the ugly and the beautiful. Unless we recognise this, no justice is possible in our judgment of the past. All history is pervaded by a Divine breath which gives it an admirable unity; but human faculties can combine its elements in infinite variety. The apostles are nearer to our comprehension than the founders of Buddhism; and yet these were the nearer in language and probably in race. Our century has witnessed religious movements quite as extraordinary as those of old, which have called forth equal enthusiasm, which have already had more martyrs in proportion [to the lapse of time], and whose future is still uncertain.

I do not speak here of the Mormons, a sect in some ways so dull and low of understanding that we hesitate to treat it seriously. Still it is instructive to see, in the open light of our century, men of our own race by the thousand, living in the midst of miracle, believing with blind faith in marvels which they claim to have seen and touched. There is already an ample literature to prove the harmony of Mormonism and science; and,

which amounts to more, this religion, built upon a silly imposture, has effected prodigies of patience and self-sacrifice; and, within five centuries, learned doctors will prove its divinity by the miracles of its establishment. Bâbism, in Persia, has been a phenomenon of far greater importance.[1] A man gentle of temper and void of self-assertion, a sort of modest and pious Spinoza, found himself, rather against his will, lifted to the rank of a miracle-worker and a divine incarnation. He became the head of a numerous, zealous, and fanatical sect, which nearly brought about a revolution that might be compared to the advent of Islam. Thousands of martyrs rushed joyfully upon a death of martyrdom for his sake. A day perhaps without parallel in all history was that when a great massacre of Bâbis took place at Teheran (in 1852). "On this day," says a narrator who was an eye-witness of the scene,[2] "a spectacle was beheld in the streets and bazaars of Teheran which the population will surely never forget. Even now (1865), when conversation turns upon this event, we may judge of the admiration, mingled with horror, felt then by the multitude, and undiminished to this day. Women and children were seen going forward into the midst of the executioners, with flesh all bare and gashed, while matches, kindled and burning, were thrust into the wounds. The victims were dragged with cords, or forced to walk by blows of a whiplash. Women and children walked on, singing a verse which

[1] See Gobineau's history of the beginnings of Bâbism: *Les relig. et les philos. dans l'Asie centrale* (Paris, 1865, 141); also that by Mirza Kazem-Beg in *Journ. Asiat.* I received at Constantinople information from two witnesses who were in close contact with the incidents, confirming the accounts of those two scholars.

[2] M. de Gobineau, before cited.

ran thus: 'In truth we come from God, and we return to God!' Their voices rose shrill above the deep silence of the crowd. As often as one of the victims fell, and was forced to rise by blows of the whip or thrusts of a bayonet, weak as he might be by loss of the blood which streamed from all his limbs, he would begin to dance, and with renewed enthusiasm would cry out, 'In truth, we are of God, and we return to him!' Some of the children expired on the passage; when the executioners cast their little bodies under the feet of their fathers and sisters, who walked on proudly over them, hardly staying to cast a glance upon them. When they came to the place of execution, the victims again were promised their life as the price of recantation. One executioner went so far as to say to a father that, if he did not yield, he would cut the throats of his two boys upon his breast. They were two children, the elder being a boy of fifteen; and, red as they were with their own blood, and their flesh burned to coal, they listened coolly to the parley. The father, casting himself on the ground, replied that he was ready; but the elder boy, eagerly claiming his privilege as the elder, demanded to have his throat cut first."[1]

This took place in 1852. The sect of Mazdak, under Chosroes Noushirvan, was stifled in just such an-

[1] Another detail, from a first-hand source, is this: in order to induce some of these sectaries to retract, they were fastened to the muzzles of cannon, primed with a slowly burning fuse. It was proposed to cut the fuse if they would renounce the Báb; but they, stretching their arms toward the fire, entreated it to make haste, and come at once to consummate their bliss. At length all was over; night fell upon a mass of mangled flesh; the victims' heads were fastened in bundles to the executioners' stake, and the dogs of the suburbs rushed in packs toward the spot.

other blood-bath. For simple natures, absolute devotion is the most exquisite of delights, and even a sort of need. In the affair of the Bâbis, some who hardly belonged to the sect were seen to come and accuse themselves, that they too might be among the sufferers. It is so sweet a thing to man to suffer for something, that in many a case the thirst for martyrdom is enough to create belief. A disciple who was executed with the Bâb, while hanging at his side on the ramparts of Tebriz, awaiting death, had only this one word to say: "Art thou satisfied with me, my master?"

Those who regard everything in history as miraculous or imaginary, which exceeds the calculations of good common sense, must find such facts as these inexplicable. The fundamental condition of true criticism is ability to comprehend the many moods of the human mind. To us, absolute faith is (it may be) a thing completely foreign. Outside the positive sciences, which give us a kind of material certainty, any opinion is to our eyes only a strong probability, implying one part truth and one part error. The portion of error may be as small as you will, but it is never reduced to zero when we have to do with an affair of morals, involving some question of art, language, literary form, or personality. But narrow and opinionated minds, such as those of Orientals, do not see it so; theirs is the enamelled eye that we find in a mosaic, fixed, expressionless, not an eye like ours. Such minds can see only one thing at a time; this one thing besets and takes possession of them: it is not in their will to believe or not; there is no more room in them for a side-thought by way of reflection. An opinion being thus embraced,

the believer readily dies for it. A martyr in religion is what a partisan is in politics. There have not been many martyrs of superior intellect. A confessor of Diocletian's time, when peace was once made with the Church, would seem to us a person of domineering temper, very much of a bigot, and something of a bore. One is never really tolerant when he sincerely thinks that he is all right, and the others are all wrong.

Since great enkindlings of religion are the result of a very narrow way of seeing things, they become an enigma to a century like ours, when the rigidity of men's convictions is relaxed. Among us a man of candour is constantly changing his opinions: first, because the world changes; and secondly, because he the observer changes too. We believe in many things at once. We love justice and truth, and for these we would risk our lives; but we do not think that they are the property of any one sect or party. As good Frenchmen, we may yet admit that the Germans or the English are in many ways our superiors. It is not so at a time when, or in a place where all are of one communion, one race, one political school, and of one complete make-up; and that is why all great religious creations have taken place under social conditions more or less like those of the East. Hitherto, indeed, absolute faith alone has succeeded in driving others from the field. A good servant-girl in Lyons, Blandina, who braved death for her faith seventeen centuries ago, — a brutal bandit chief, Clovis, who found it good to embrace the Catholic faith fourteen centuries ago, — these still prescribe our creed.

Who is there that, in traversing our ancient cities

become modern, has not stayed his steps beneath the gigantic monuments of the faith of bygone ages? All around them is made new; not a vestige is left of the customs of old; but the cathedral has remained, — a little spoiled, perhaps, as high as a man's hand can reach, but deeply rooted in the soil. There let it stand by its own weight (*mole suâ stet*)! its solid mass is its right to be. It has withstood a deluge that has swept away everything about it; not one of the men of aforetime who should come back to revisit the spot where he lived would find his house; the raven alone, that has built its nest in the pinnacles of the sacred edifice, has never seen the hammer lifted against his dwelling. Strange privilege! Those martyrs who acted in good faith, those rude converts, those pirate church-builders, are our masters still. We are Christians, because it pleased them to be so. As in politics it is only the barbaric foundations that endure, so in religion it is only spontaneous and (if I may call it so) fanatical convictions that will spread by their own power. The fact is, a religion is the work of a people. Its success does not depend on the better or worse proofs it can give that it is divine; its success is just in proportion as it speaks to the popular heart.

Does it follow from this that religion is destined to wither by degrees and to disappear, like the popular errors as to magic, witchcraft, and spirit-manifestations? Surely not. Religion itself is not a popular error. It is a great truth of instinct, half-seen by the people, uttered by the people. All symbols that serve to give shape to the religious sentiment are imperfect, and are destined to be cast aside, one after another. But nothing is falser than the dream of certain persons

who think to conceive a perfect humanity, in conceiving it without religion. We should put it just the other way. China, which is an inferior humanity, is almost destitute of religion. On the other hand, let us suppose a planet inhabited by a race of mankind whose intellectual, moral, and physical power should be double that of our earthly humanity, it would be at least twice as religious as our own. I say "at least," for it is likely that the growth of the religious faculties would go on at a still more rapid rate than that of the intellectual capacity, and not merely in an equal ratio. Let us suppose a humanity ten times mightier than ours; it would be infinitely more religious. It is even probable that man — at that height of sublimity, detached from all material cares and all selfish considerations, gifted with a perfect sense of touch and a taste divinely delicate, seeing how base and void is all excepting the true, the beautiful, and the good — would be wholly religious, absorbed in perpetual adoration, passing from ecstasy to ecstasy, born, living, and dying in a flood of joy. Selfishness, which measures the degree of inferiority in any creature, lessens in proportion as man is lifted above the brute. A perfect being would be no longer selfish, he would be wholly religious. The effect of progress, therefore, will be the expansion of religion, not its destruction or its decay.

But it is time to return to our three missionaries, Paul, Barnabas, and John Mark, whom we left just as they set forth from Antioch by the gate opening to Seleucia. In a succeeding volume ("Saint Paul") I shall attempt to follow the footsteps of these messengers of good tidings, by land and sea, through calm and storm, through good and evil days. I am impa-

tient to return to the story of this unequalled epic, — to trace those numberless highways of Asia and Europe along which they sowed the good seed of the gospel, and those floods which they crossed so often, under such varying conditions. The great Christian Odyssey will now begin. Already the apostolic bark has spread her sails; the wind breathes softly, breathing only to bear upon its wings the words of Jesus.

INDEX.

Acts, book of, 6, 15, 25; author and date, 9–13; it favours Roman authority; its plan, 16; its compromising tone; 17, 24; its account of Paul, 18, 20, 21.
Adiabene, converts from (Helen), 221–225.
Agabus (a prophet), 211.
Alexandria, 178, 244, 302.
Ananias (of Damascus), 172, 222.
Ananias and Sapphira, 97, 103.
Antioch, 13, 194–200; situation, 198, 237; luxury and corruption, 196–198; Church in, 200–203, 204, 205, 206.
Apocalypse, 13.
Apollos, 241.
Apostles in Jerusalem, 99, 100, 101.
Apparitions, 5, 50, 52, 53, 67; in Galilee, 62.
Aretas (Hâreth), 143, 175.
Ascension, accounts of, 79.
Asmonæan kings, 220.
Associations under Roman law, 290–294, 300.

Bâbism 305–307.
Barnabas, 115, 173, 189–193, 200, 204, 205, 206, 211–213, 237.
Boëthus, house of, 216.
Brothers of Jesus, 75, 76, 101.
Buddhism, 122.
Burial societies, 289–291.

Cæsarea, 155, 158, 185, 193.
Caiaphas, 137, 144.
Caligula, 177, 178–181, 213, 242.
Candace (a title), 23, 153.
Charities of the early Church, 126, 132.
Christ, not a personal name, 207.
Christian, the name, 206; character, 300.
Christianity not miraculous, 30.
Circumcision, question of, 21, 22.
Colossians (epistle to), 10.
Common property in early Church, 126; its disastrous results, 95, 96.
Controversy, 83.
Corinth, 301.
Cornelius at Cæsarea, 185–187.
Council (so called) at Jerusalem, 23.
Creed, primitive, 195.
Cyprus, 116.

Damascus, 18, 172, 177, 182.
Daphne, 195.
Deacons appointed, 125; their services, 126, 148.
Death penalty, 102.
Dositheus, 235.

Ebionism, 95.
Ecclesia, 101.
Egypt and Palestine, Jews in, 136, 240.
Emmaus, visit to, 54–56, 59.
Euodias, 208.
Excommunication, penalty of, 103.

Family life, as modified by Christianity, 130–132.
Felix, procurator, 229, 236.
Future life, conceptions of, 109.

Galatians, epistle to, 4, 19, 24, 25, 188, 190, 191.

Galilæans, 116, 207.
Galilee, retreat of Christians in, 60–72; later Christianity in, 73, 74.
Gamaliel, 139, 163.
Gnostic doctrines of Simon Magus, 230, 232–234.
Greece, religion of, 277.
Greek, the language, 116, 160, 203.

Hanan, 137.
Healing, gift of, 109.
Hebrews (the original Christians), 118.
Helen of Adiabene, 221.
Hellenists, 118, 120, 145.
Hermon, Mt., 167, 170.
Herod Agrippa, 175, 213; a persecutor, 216, 237; his death, 218.
History, composition of, 32.
Hypothesis in history, 4.

Illusions, 56–58, 59.
Izates, 222.

James, 19, 20, 76.
Jerusalem, church at, 210, 216, 220, 237.
Jews at Antioch, 199, 203, 208; in Rome, 244; of the Dispersion, 242; Egypt, 136; in Damascus, 221.
John, 47, *n.*
Joppa, 155; Peter in, 184.
Josephus, 226, 236, 248.
Judaism, its contribution to Christianity, 132, 242.
Judas (Iscariot), 99; the Gaulonite, 227.

Lightning in the Lebanon, 170.
Lucius, 238.
Luke, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 95.

Maran atha, 106.
Mark, 116, 237, 238.
Maronites, 203.
Martha and Mary (of Bethany), 113.
Martyrdom, 145.
Mary of Magdala, at the sepulchre, 46–50.
Matthias, 100.
Menahem, 227, 238.
Messiah (the title), 207.
Miracle, question of, 27–30, 69; accounts of, 314.
Monastic spirit, 135.
Mormonism, 304.

Nazarene (the name), 207.

Oriental religions, 280, 283.

Parthia, 238.
Paul, 2, 7, 8, 18, 26, 141, 147, 157–163, 175; his conversion, 67–174; vision, 209; at Damascus, 172, 188–193; at Jerusalem, 188–192; at Cæsarea, 193; at Antioch, 205, 238; epistles, 25.
Peter, 47, 55, 64, 104, 137–152; his miracles, 102, 182, 184; vision at Joppa, 184; at Jerusalem, 188; in prison, 216; at Antioch, 237.
Pharisees, 138.
Philip (the deacon), 148–156.
Philo before Caligula, 179–181, 241.
Pillar-saints at Antioch, 202, 206.
Plutarch, 277, 278.
Poverty in the early Church, 122.
Preaching, 113–115.
Prophecy, 110, 211.
Proselytes in Damascus, etc., 221.
Protestantism, 36, 174.

Repast in common, 98, 135.
Resurrection of Jesus, first accounts, 41–59; witnesses to, 105.
Reticence in matters of belief, 37, 38.
Ritual, 107, 108.
Roman authority, 13, 141, 143.
Roman Empire as forerunner of Christianity, 239; Roman Empire, 255; spirit, 256, 263; philosophy, 258; administration, 259; personal liberty in, 261; theatres, 260, 265; philanthropy, 267; intellectual decline, 269.
Rome, policy of, 283.

Sadducees, 139.
Samaria, mission in, 148–156.
Scripture, use of, 106.

Simon of Gitton (Simon Magus), 150, 226–233.
Singing, 111.
Spirit, promise of, 77; gifts of, 87, 92; descent of, 84, 201, 208; inspiration of, 237.
Stephen, 125; his preaching, 139; death, 141–145.
Stoicism, 263, 274, 279, 281.
Syriac (the language), 120.
Syrian character and religion, 249.

Talmud, 120, 226.
Tarsus, 158, 193, 205.
Theudas, 227, 229.
Tongues, gift of, 85–90, 209.
Twelve, the, 2, 190.

Visions, 5, 48; in Galilee, 62, 82; of Peter, 65; of Paul, 209.
Vitellius, 142.

Women as propagators of Christianity, 43, 45, 71, 104; in the East, 128; in Christian work, 126–130.

Zealots, 228.

Messrs. Roberts Brothers' Publications.

LIFE OF JESUS.

By ERNEST RENAN,

Author of "History of the People of Israel," "The Future of Science."

From the twenty-third French edition. With notes. Revised and enlarged. 8vo. Cloth. $2.50.

The new edition, recently published in this city by the enterprising house of Roberts Brothers, of Ernest Renan's "Life of Jesus," uniform in style with this great scholar and writer's "History of the People of Israel," will for all future time be the standard edition in English of what is now "widely recognized as the one great literary monument of a century of New Testament criticism." The translation has been newly revised from the twenty-third and final edition, which was revised and corrected with the greatest care by Renan. The editor of this edition is Joseph Henry Allen, of Cambridge, a well-known scholar, who is eminently fitted for the important task which he has here undertaken. Mr. Allen has revised the two best known English translations existing, recasting nearly every sentence, and scrupulously weighing the whole, phrase by phrase, with the original. He has also verified every one of Renan's multitude of citations. It seems to us that the entire work could not have been more perfectly rendered into English. A wonderful change has taken place in the general Christian world during the past thirty years in its attitude towards Renan and his "Life of Jesus." He was for years, after the appearance of the earliest editions of his book, denounced as an agnostic, an atheist, and a blasphemer by evangelical Christians who are ready now to acknowledge the wonderful scholarship, the genius, the purity of motive, the devout reverence of his work, while of course totally disagreeing with Renan in his rejection of the supernatural and the divinity of Jesus. It has become the standard work of its kind among theologians; for the honesty of purpose and sincerity of its author, together with the wonderful beauty and devoutness displayed throughout the entire work, is freely recognized. No writer ever treated Jesus in a more tender and appreciative spirit than has Renan. It seems to us that, while the believer in the New Testament record in its entirety will not have his faith shaken in the supernatural portion, he will rise from a reading of this book with a more intense love for Christ, and a fuller realization of the stupendous mission which was involved in his brief active life upon the earth. — *Boston Home Journal.*

Sold by all Booksellers. Mailed, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS, Boston.

THE BIBLE FOR LEARNERS.

By Dr. H. OORT, Professor of Oriental Languages at Amsterdam, and Dr. I. HOOYKAAS, Pastor at Rotterdam, with the assistance of Dr. A. KUENEN, Professor of Theology at Leiden. Translated from the Dutch, by Rev. P. H. WICKSTEED, of London. With a Comprehensive Index, made specially for this edition, and Maps. 3 vols. 12mo. Cloth.

OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. I. Patriarchs, Moses, Judges. — Vol. II. Kings, and Prophets. $4.00.

NEW TESTAMENT. Vol. III. The New Testament. $2.00.

"This work emanates from the Dutch school of theologians. Nowhere in Europe," said the lamented J. J. Tayler, "has theological science assumed a bolder or more decisive tone than in Holland, though always within the limits of profound reverence, and an unenfeebled attachment to the divine essence of the gospel. . . . We know of no work done here which gives such evidence of solid scholarship joined to a deep and strong religious spirit."

It is the Bible story, told in a connected form, with a history of the book and of the Bible countries and peoples. It properly treats of the Bible as the book of religion,— not of one particular form, but of religion itself, — "because the place of honor, in the religious life of mankind and of each man in particular, belongs to the person of Jesus, and because it is upon Jesus that the whole Bible turns." It is by keeping in sight the fact that the Bible is a religious book, and is meant to furnish answers to the questions "Who and what is God?" and "What are we to do and what leave undone?" — and is not nor was meant to be a book of science or history, that the authors have made so valuable a work. — *Golden Rule.*

As a working manual for the Sunday-school teacher it will be found of great value. Notwithstanding its title, it is a work for all, with or without Bible learning. The scholar will value it for its conciseness and labor-saving references; the general reader for the interest it possesses as a clear and interesting narrative, easily understood, in which the explanations, thoughts, and ideas of every great expounder have a greater or less place. — *Boston Transcript.*

The object of the work has been to reduce the narratives of Scripture to the understanding of youth and the unlearned, with such additional information as will serve to better elucidate the record and lead the reader to value its contents as a guide. Its simplicity of diction and the writer's infusion of a zealous spirit into some of its narratives will commend it to a favorable consideration. — *Chicago Journal.*

Sold everywhere by all Booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, by the Publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.

By ERNEST RENAN,

Author of "Life of Jesus."

VOL.
I. Till the Time of King David.
II. From the Reign of David up to the Capture of Samaria.
III. From the time of Hezekiah till the Return from Babylon.
IV. From the Rule of the Persians to that of the Greeks.
V. Period of Jewish Independence and Judea under Roman Rule. (With Index.)

8vo. Cloth. Price, $2.50 per volume.

Renan's "History of Israel" may be said to consist of three parts. The first two volumes contain the analysis of the events that led up to the rise of the prophets; in the third, he unfolds his view of those prophets; while the last two illustrate the course of the prophetical ideas, steadily making their way, despite constantly recurring backsets, till their final triumph in Jesus. Viewing the five volumes as a whole, their interest centres in Renan's interpretation of Hebrew history; and it may safely be said that nothing that he has done reveals the brilliancy of his mind and the greatness of his intellectual grasp as does this monument, which he was fortunately permitted to finish before his life came to an end.

These last pages, written with all the vigor that characterizes his earliest productions, furnish an admirable means of forming a fair estimate of the man Renan himself. To those who are fond of denouncing him as a cynic, the sympathy which his last words breathe for suffering and struggling humanity constitute the best reply. He has often been called a sceptic, and yet one may search far and wide through modern literature for stronger expressions of true religious faith than are to be found in Renan's works. Above all, the testimony must be given to him which he most valued, — that his whole life was actuated by a love of truth He made personal sacrifices for what he considered to be the truth. He investigated fearlessly; and when he spoke, the ring of sincerity in his utterances was never wanting, while the boldness of these utterances was always tempered with a proper consideration for those who held opinions differing from his. All this is applicable in a marked degree to the last work that issued from his restless pen.

It may safely be predicted that Renan's latest production will take rank as his most important since the "Life of Jesus" There is the same charming style, the same brilliancy of treatment, the same clear judgment and delicate touches, the deep thoughts and thorough mastery of his subject, which have made Renan one of the most fascinating of modern writers. — *New York Times.*

To all who know anything of M. Renan's "Life of Jesus" it will be no surprise that the same writer has told the "History of the People of Israel till the Time of King David" as it was never told before nor is ever like to be told again. For but once in centuries does a Renan arise, and to any other hand this work were impossible. Throughout it is the perfection of paradox, for, dealing wholly with what we are all taught to lisp at the mother's knee, it is more original than the wildest romance; more heterodox than heterodoxy, it is yet full of large and tender reverence for that supreme religion that brightens all time as it transcends all creeds. — *The Commercial Advertiser.*

Sold by all Booksellers. Mailed, postpaid, on receipt of price, by the Publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS, Boston, Mass.

Messrs. Roberts Brothers' Publications.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

A MANUAL.

Translated from the Dutch of J. Knappert, Pastor of Leiden.
By RICHARD ARMSTRONG, B. A.

16mo. Price $1.00.

From the Boston Daily Advertiser.

Its purpose is to give a faithful and accurate account of the results of modern research into the early development of the Israelitish religion. Without attempting to set forth the facts and considerations by which the most thorough and accomplished scholars have reached their conclusions respecting the origin and date of the several books of the Old Testament, those conclusions are briefly stated, and the gradual development of the Jewish form of religion traced down to the Christian era. . . .

The translator says that there may be those who will be painfully startled by some of the statements which are made in the work. In his view, however, it is far better that the young especially should learn from those who are friendly to religion what is now known of the actual origin of the Scriptures, rather than to be left in ignorance till they are rudely awakened by the enemies of Christianity from a blind and unreasoning faith in the supernatural inspiration of the Scriptures.

From the Providence Journal.

If this Manual were not an exponent of Dutch theologians in high repute among their own countrymen, and if it were not an expression of the honest conviction of Rev. J. Knappert, the pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church at Leiden, we should feel inclined to pass it by, for it is not pleasant to have doctrines and facts rudely questioned that have been firmly held as sacred truths for a lifetime. And yet one cannot read "The Religion of Israel" without feeling that the writer is an earnest seeker after the truth, and has carefully weighed and diligently examined the premises on which his arguments are based, and the conclusions which he presents as the result of his researches. . . .

The book is one of singular and stirring interest: it speaks with an air of authority that will command attention; and, though it ruthlessly transforms time-honored beliefs into myths and poetic allegories, it makes its bold attacks with a reverent hand, and an evident desire to present the truth and nothing but the truth.

From the Boston Christian Register.

Here we have, for a dollar just what many liberal Sunday schools are praying for, — a book which gives in a compact form the conclusions of the "advanced scholarship" concerning the Old Testament record. Taking Kuenen's great 'History of Israel" for a guide, Dr. Knappert has outlined what may be called the reverently rational view of that religious literature and development which led up to "the fulness of times," or the beginning of Christianity.

Sold everywhere by all Booksellers. Mailed, postpaid, by the Publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

POSITIVE RELIGION.

ESSAYS, FRAGMENTS, AND HINTS.

By JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN,

Author of "Christian History in its Three Great Periods," "Hebrew Men and Times," etc.

16MO. CLOTH. PRICE, $1.25.

Among the subjects treated may be noted the following, viz.: "How Religions Grow," "A Religion of Trust," "The World-Religions," "The Death of Jesus," "The Question of a Future Life," "The Bright Side," "Religion and Modern Life," etc.

The subjects are discussed, as one will indeed plainly see, by a learned Christian scholar, and from that height in life's experience which one reaches at three score and ten years. They treat of the growth of religion; of religion as an experience; of the terms "Agnostic" and "God"; of the mystery of pain, of immortality and kindred topics. The author is among the best known of the older Unitarians, and the breadth of his views, together with his modesty of statement and ripeness of judgment, give the book a charm not too common in religious works. The literary style is also pleasing. — *Advertiser.*

This little volume of 260 pages contains much that is fresh and interesting and some things which are true only from a Unitarian standpoint. It is always delightful to read an author who knows what he is writing about, and can present his thoughts in a clear and forcible manner. His intention is to exhibit religion not so much "as a thing of opinion, of emotion, or of ceremony, as an element in men's own experience, or a force, mighty and even passionate, in the world's affairs." Such an endeavor is highly laudable, and the work has been well done. — *Christian Mirror.*

A collection of a acute, reverent, and suggestive talks on some of the great themes of religion. Many Christians will dissent from his free handling of certain traditional views, dogmas of Christianity, but they will be at once with him in his love of goodness and truth, and in his contention that religion finds its complete fruition in the lives rather than the speculative opinions of men. — *N. Y. Tribune.*

Mr. Allen strikes straight out from the shoulder, with energy that shows his natural force not only unabated, but increased with added years. "At Sixty: A New Year Letter" is sweet and mellow with the sunshine of the years that bring the philosophic mind. But we are doing what we said that we must not, and must make an arbitrary end. Yet not without a word of admiration for the splendid force and beauty of many passages. These are the product of no artifice, but are uniformly an expression of that humanity which is the writer's constant end and inspiration. In proportion as this finds free and full expression, the style assumes a warmth and color that not only give an intellectual pleasure, but make the heart leap up with sympathetic courage and resolve. — *J. W. C.*

Sold everywhere.

ROBERTS BROTHERS, Publishers.

CHRISTIAN HISTORY

IN ITS THREE GREAT PERIODS. First Period: *Early Christianity.* By Joseph Henry Allen, Lecturer on Ecclesiastical History in Harvard University. With Chronological Outline and Index, and an Introduction on the Study of Christian History. 16mo. Cloth. Price, $1.25.

Topics: 1. The Messiah and the Christ; 2. Saint Paul; 3. Christian Thought of the Second Century; 4. The Mind of Paganism; 5. The Arian Controversy; 6. Saint Augustine; 7. Leo the Great; 8. Monasticism as a Moral Force; 9. Christianity in the East; 10. Conversion of the Barbarians; 11. The Holy Roman Empire; 12. The Christian Schools; 13. Canon Law.

"In whatever way we regard the origin and early growth of Christianity, whether as special revelation or as historic evolution, the key to it is to be found not in its speculative dogma, not in its ecclesiastical organization, not even in what strictly constitutes its religious life, but in its fundamentally ethical character. In either way of understanding it, it is first of all a gospel for the salvation of human life." — *Preface.*

"I have read your Fragments of Christian History with instruction and delight. You are a miracle of candor and comprehensiveness. . . . You and Dr. Hedge are almost the only men who know thoroughly the whole grand field of Ecclesiastical History. . . . I most cordially send you my thanks for such an illumination as you have given me, on many obscure points of Christian History." — *E. P. Whipple to the Author.*

"We do not desire to state an unqualified agreement with all the conclusions of Professor Allen, and yet we are free to confess that we know of no work of the same scope which could be put into the hands of a thoughtful young man, in which he could find so much sound philosophy, valuable historical review, and devout apprehension of essential Christianity as he will find in 'Fragments of Christian History.'" — *Chicago Alliance.*

Sold everywhere by all booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, by the publishers,

ROBERTS BROTHERS, Boston.

THE FUTURE OF SCIENCE.

BY ERNEST RENAN.

One Volume. 8vo. 515 pages. Cloth. Price, $2.50.

"It would be difficult to name a man of literary genius comparable in breadth and depth of learning, or fertility and charm of expression, to M. Ernest Renan. Certainly in all France there is none like him. The fact is just as plain that both in and out of France he has been persistently misunderstood by certain of his readers, and misrepresented by those who have not and will not read him. He has, for instance, been called a man without a religion, and now, as though in answer to this statement, and by way of refuting the commoner charge that levity is the characteristic and habitual frame of mind in which he lives, he has published a volume entitled 'The Future of Science' (Boston: Roberts Brothers), wherein he sums up the new faith which with him has replaced 'shattered Catholicism.' . . .

"It should not be supposed that M. Renan is here seriously attempting to found a new religion, or even to formulate a new system of philosophy. We have read the volume rather as a personal statement of the delights of learning and of productive scholarship, and as such it has a distinct and rare value. Nowhere does it open itself to a profitable criticism that would refuse to challenge the veracity of the author." — *Philadelphia Press.*

"Although Ernest Renan wrote much of this book many years ago (shortly after he left the Catholic Church) it is to-day an epitome of the most advanced modern thought. In a style so exquisitely simple that we think not of the words nor of the writer but only of the thought, he sums up what science has done for us already. We are brought into full view of the idols it has knocked down. With clear vision we can look back and see the long road up which the human race has toiled; our eyes, thanks to science, unclouded by superstition, can study it. And how much man's position has altered! He was not especially created. He was not foreordained to everlasting punishment, nor elected to eternal bliss. And this great change of thought, affecting the foundations of our social, political, and religious being, we owe to science. . . .

Will science ever clear away the rubbish and show us a broader, fairer land than that which has encouraged the toilers before? Renan's book gives great hope of this. It is written in a tone of courage and cheerfulness that is very inspiring. He admits the danger of the transition period, the relaxation of moral strength with the stimulus removed. "Chimeras have succeeded in obtaining from the good gorilla an astonishing moral effort; do away with the chimeras and part of the factitious energy they aroused will disappear." But when between the lines of this book we can detect, as we do, a spirit devout, tender, upright, cheerful, and serene, it seems that the future state of pure rationalism which science aims to bring about would not be incompatible with human goodness and happiness." — *Chicago Tribune.*

Sold by all Booksellers. Mailed, postpaid, by the publishers.

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

Messrs. Roberts Brothers' Publications.

HEBREW MEN AND TIMES

FROM THE

Patriarchs to the Messiah.

By JOSEPH HENRY ALLEN,

LECTURER ON ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

New Edition, with an Introduction on the results of recent Old Testament criticism. Chronological Outline and Index. 16mo. Price, $1.50.

TOPICS: 1. The Patriarchs; 2. Moses; 3. The Judges; 4. David; 5. Solomon; 6. The Kings; 7. The Law; 8. The Prophets; 9. The Captivity; 10. The Maccabees; 11. The Alexandrians; 12. The Messiah.

Extract from the Preface: "... There seemed room and need of a clear, brief sketch, or outline; one that should spare the details and give the results of scholarship; that should trace the historical sequences and connections, without being tangled in questions of mere erudition, or literary discussions, or theological polemics; that should preserve the honest independence of scholarly thought, along with the temper of Christian faith; that should not lose from sight the broad perspective of secular history, while it should recognize at each step the hand of 'Providence as manifest in Israel.' Such a want as this the present volume aims to meet."

Rev. O. B. Frothingham in the Christian Examiner.

"We shall be satisfied to have excited interest enough in the theme to induce readers to take up Mr. Allen's admirable book and trace through all the richness and variety of his detail the eventful history of this Hebrew thought. His pages, with which we have no fault to find save the very uncommon fault of being too crowded and too few, will throw light on many things which must be utterly dark now to the unlearned mind; they will also revive the declining respect for a venerable people, and for a faith to which we owe much more than some of us suspect. For, however untrammelled Mr. Allen's criticism may be, his thought is always serious and reverential. And the reader of his pages, while confessing that their author has cleared away many obstructions in the way of history, will confess also that he has only made freer the access to the halls of faith. There is no light or loose or unbecoming sentence in the volume. There is no insincere paragraph. There is no heedless line. And this perhaps is one of the greatest charms of the book; for it is rare indeed that both intellect and heart are satisfied with the same letters."

Sold everywhere by all booksellers. Mailed, post-paid, by the publishers.

ROBERTS BROTHERS, BOSTON.

270.1
R25

AUTHOR
Renan

TITLE
Apostles

HIC LIBER RELATUS EST IN
INDICEM LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM

PER DECRETUM

11 iun. 1866

UNDE LEGENDUS NON EST
NISI AB IIS QUI LICENTIA
A COMPETENTI AUCTORITATE
ECCLESIASTICA MUNITI SUNT

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709